

April 1961

vol 56 | no 7

THE  
CLASSICAL  
JOURNAL

April 1961

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

vol 56 | no 7

The Poetic Achievement of Virgil:	VICTOR PÖSCHL	293
THE FORUM		300
Orpheus and Eurydice: Some Modern Versions:	M. OWEN LEE	307
WE SEE BY THE PAPERS		314
Producing Greek Tragedy:	O. G. BROCKERT	317
BOOK REVIEWS		324
Announcement		336

## EDITORIAL BOARD

editor-in-chief: NORMAN T. PRATT, Jr., Indiana University  
for the atlantic states: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State University  
for new england: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College  
for the pacific states: W. M. GRAM, University of California  
book reviews: FRED W. HOUNGHEIMER, Jr., Indiana University  
the forum: MRS. MARGARET M. FORBES, University of Minnesota  
from other journals: ROGER A. HORNEBY, State University of Iowa  
we see by the papers: RICHARD M. FRANK, Jr., Tulane University

## BUSINESS STAFF

managing editor: J. D. SALLER, Furman University  
circulation manager: PAUL R. MURPHY, Ohio University

## PRODUCTION

design consultant: RONALD W. SUMMER, Indiana University

The Classical Journal is published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., with the cooperation of the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Pacific States, and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Second-class postage paid at Athens, Ohio, and at additional mailing offices.



photograph from the Fototeca di Architettura e Topografia dell'Italia Antica

Capri, Roman villa at Damecuta above the Blue Grotto

## THE POETIC ACHIEVEMENT OF VIRGIL

VIKTOR PÖSCHL

AT THE END of antiquity the poems of Virgil were regarded as the sum of all wisdom and all knowledge. Donatus conceives the three main works of the poet, the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, as the expression of three steps in the evolution of civilization: that of shepherds, of farmers and of warriors. Servius understands the three manners of style in Virgil not as stages but as forms of existence. In the Neoplatonic outlook of Macrobius there is a "great similarity" between the divine creation and the poetic work of Virgil. The work of the poet is for him an image and mirror of the universe. These are exaggerations of right perceptions, but Virgil's works are indeed comprehensive syntheses. He is the classic of the Occident because his poetry achieves a synthesis of ancient civilization.

The *Aeneid* leads us to the most important places of the Roman Empire. Aeneas comes from Troy to Italy and visits famous places: Delos; Crete; the coast of Epirus, where Actium will be later; Sicily; Carthage; Velia, the famous Elea in southern Italy, the town of Parmenides; Cumae; Latium; Ro-

man Palatine; Etruria and the main lands of Italy. The Homeric wanderings of Odysseus, the travels through far and fabulous countries, wonderlands of fairy tale, turn into travels which lead the hero through countries of historical significance: the mountains, Olympus, Athos, Aetna, Atlas, Eryx, Ida, the Apennines and the Alps, are drawn in impressive verses; the rivers: the Rhine, Euphrates, Ganges, legendary Eridanus, and the Italian Tiber, Atesis and Po. The epic gives an image of the world of that time. This image is, as Herder pointed out, a characteristic feature of the epic genre in general.

Greek and Roman gods, Greek and Roman rites, are present in the *Aeneid*. But there is no distinction between Greek and Roman elements. Virgil as a Roman has the proud feeling: all that belongs to us. These are our gods, this is our world, immense and various in its riches and full of history. Thus Greek and Roman religion and history have found their place in the *Aeneid*.

But the works of Virgil are still more the summary of an inner civilization. They are the quintessence of the moral ideals that Greeks and Romans laid



down. We are faced with the ideal of Homeric heroism in Turnus, the enemy of Aeneas. He is a second Hector, struggling heroically against foreign invaders, but at the same time he is Achilles in his readiness for death. This readiness is hinted at by the simile of the wounded lion, which stands like an emblem on the first leaf of the book of Turnus, the last book of the *Aeneid*, suggesting the greatness of the hero in his fall. In his talk with King Latinus he declares himself ready to die for glory's sake (12. 49: *letumque sinas pro laude pacisci*). This is an echo of the decision of Achilles, *Iliad* 18. 114-16 (Lattimore's translation):

Now I shall go, to overtake that killer of a dear life,  
Hektor; then I will accept my own death, at whatever  
time Zeus wishes to bring it about, and the other immortals.

But the marvelous composure with which the Homeric hero looks forward to his end is blended with a strained strength and sullen readiness to fulfill his fate which another Greek hero shows as he goes to the duel with his brother: Eteocles in Aeschylus' tragedy *The Seven against Thebes*.

Loneliness, too, Turnus has in common with Achilles. "Hector is the defender of Troy, but also son, husband, father, brother, brother-in-law. On him rests the fortune of many. This makes his struggle so hard, his figure so human" (W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, p. 108). Turnus, on the contrary, is alone like Achilles. His relations with Lavinia, his bride, remain dim. His father and his divine mother do not appear at all. Only his sister Juturna gives a human dimension to his fate as Thetis does for Achilles. Turnus in his loneliness contrasts with Aeneas who appears among his family and his people, like Hector. It is one of the most outstand-

ing features in the figure of Aeneas.

Moreover, Turnus is connected with Achilles by his loyalty to his followers and by the fact that he is compelled to betray them. Deceived by the gods, he follows a phantom and goes on board a ship, while Aeneas advances victoriously. And when he becomes aware of the delusion, he is torn by despair and tortured by the feeling of having lost his honor through his flight and the sacrifice of his followers to the enemy. These are feelings that the Homeric Achilles knows, too (*Iliad* 18. 98-100):

I must die soon, then; since I was not to stand by my companion when he was killed. And now, far away from the land of his fathers, he has perished, and lacked my fighting strength to defend him.

But again with the Homeric reminiscences are combined others from tragedy. In his bitter loneliness and abandonment, Turnus, like Ajax in Sophocles' tragedy, turns to the forces of nature, to which alone he can address his longing for death (10. 676).

Dido, too, in many respects is a mirror of Greek heroines. She has in her something of the Medea and the Phaedra of Euripides. Like Antigone she turns in her distress to her sister: Dido's address, *unanima soror*, is a reflection of *ô koinôn autâdelphon Isménēs kára*, the first words of Sophocles' *Antigone*. The death of Lausus, who sacrifices his life for his father, is a reflection of the death of Antilochus, who dies for his father Nestor in the epic called *Aethiopis*; this epic has not been preserved, but Virgil probably knew it. Hellenistic poetry contributes essential elements, too, especially the epic of Apollonius Rhodius. We find traces of Roman tragedy, and would notice them more clearly, if there were more of it extant. Above all, Ennius, the creator of Roman hexameter epic, is merged into the *Aeneid*. Beyond Ennius, Virgil

goes back to Naevius who first introduced Dido in Roman poetry and to the pre-literary Roman epic, whose existence can hardly be doubted. It is proved by the archaic form of the epic language of the oldest epic poet, Livius Andronicus, who uses forms certainly not current in his own time; Rome had an oral epic tradition which conserved these archaic forms.

Lucretius, too, contributed a good deal to the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics*. Without the ardor of his philosophy and his design of investigating the system and the nature of the universe, the sixth book of the *Aeneid* would not have been possible.

The Neoterics, known to us only by the most famous of them, Catullus, must not be forgotten, either. They contributed much toward the refinement of the poetical language and the art of composition of the Romans. Dido is akin to the Ariadne of Catullus, in whom the passion of frustrated love struck a new note in Latin and Occidental poetry. Some of his poems anticipate the most moving strains of Virgilian language and style. Virgil himself began as a Neoteric poet: the *Eclogues*, which follow the *Idylls* of Theocritus, are inventions in the playful manner of the Neoteric poetry.

The poems of Virgil are the sum of ancient poetry and of ancient *humanitas*. The *Aeneid* represents, in impressive scenes and gestures, a cosmos of human relationships: relationships of father and son, of sister and brother, of friends with friends, of enemy with enemy, man and wife. The moral cosmos of the *Aeneid* is the result of a long permeation of Roman civilization with Greek ethics. The famous words of Dido, "Not ignorant of evil, / I know one thing, at least, — to help the wretched" (*non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco*; Humphries' translation), are

linked with Hellenistic philosophy, with Menander and Terence: I am a human being, nothing human is alien to me (*Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto*). The statement of Hellenistic philosophy, that it is a property of virtue to win men's hearts (Cic. *Off.* 2. 17), is Virgil's conviction. Without Panaetius and Cicero the *Aeneid* could not be imagined, and still less without Plato and Platonism. The view of the world that underlies the whole poem is based on Platonic ideas; thus the idea of the transcendent origin of the soul and of the home to which it is longing to escape from the fetters of the body (6. 314); their hands, in longing, reach out for the farther shore: *tendebantque manus ripae ulterioris amore*. Aeneas is so filled with the brightness of the Elysian fields, so depressed by the painful experiences of this earthly life, that he cannot conceive the soul's wanting to come back from the place of bliss to the earth. And no less Platonic is the idea that the cosmos of the state realizing itself in Roman history rests on the greater cosmos of the universe. Both ideas had been naturalized in Rome by Cicero.

But the *Aeneid* is more than an inspired selective synthesis. It contains new modes of human behavior and new poetic forms.

One important feature I should mention is the extreme tenderness and discretion with which Virgilian characters communicate with one another. It has always struck me, with what perfect tact Anchises speaks with his son about the Dido affair. He does not mention Dido, of course, nor the word "love." He only says: *Quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent!* In the *Georgics* Aristaeus, son of a god and a nymph, has lost his bees. The reason for his loss, as it turns out, was that the nymphs were angry with him be-

cause he had pursued their sister Eurydice and that, while she was fleeing from him, she had been bitten by a snake and had died. Orpheus went to the underworld to win her freedom and succeeded by the power of his song. But when he was returning, Eurydice was lost for ever. Then the nymphs make Aristaeus' bees die. He comes to his mother, the nymph Cyrene, to complain and ask her help. She advises him to go to Proteus, who knows all things, to ask why he has lost the bees and to seek his help. Proteus reveals why he lost them, but says nothing about how to get them back, although this might have been expected from the words of Cyrene. With perfect feeling for what is appropriate, Virgil attributes the part of helping to the loving mother who will do everything for her son. Why then—so it has been asked—did Virgil need Proteus? Could not Cyrene know the reason for the death of the bees? Certainly she could. But Virgil spared her the awkward role of telling her son that he had behaved badly to Eurydice, and of explaining to him what had been the result of it. That was one of the reasons why he introduced Proteus. The same feeling for the fitting, the sense of tact, the striving not to jar upon the sensibilities of others, is to be noticed in the shepherds of the *Eclogues*, who differ in this respect from those of Theocritus. Even in the passage where some have thought that Aeneas lacks tact—in the famous episode where he withstands Dido's entreaties not to go away—he is not to be judged so severely. It has been well pointed out that here he is cruel not only to Dido but to himself. And I suppose one feature at least shows the subtle sensibility of the poet: to make his situation understandable to his beloved, Aeneas speaks of another renunciation fate had

forced upon him, the renunciation of return to Troy and of rebuilding the destroyed city. The departure from Dido revives this deep wound in his heart. He tries to make Dido realize that he is condemned to give up all he loves best.

Turnus, as we said, mirrors the Homeric form of heroism. But it is new, that he is the mythological symbol of Italic heroism, of those peoples who for centuries struggled against Rome and bled to death. Virgil, of Italic origin himself, admires and loves them as does Livy. And it is new, that he lends expression to the irrational principle in history and in the political world, the working of demonic forces that delay the empire of justice and peace willed by the gods. Homer was not aware of the irrationality of power as Virgil was. The Romans had an instinct for the irrational forces in politics long before Tacitus.

The figure of Aeneas is determined not only by Greek ethics and the Roman *mos maiorum*, but by a new, very personal note, in which we feel the coming of Christianity. When Aeneas hears that he is chosen to be the leader of all the Italians, he is seized by sorrow and sadness, not because he has been given too few soldiers, as ancient and modern commentators believe—how can he be disappointed, when the mighty nation of the Etruscans comes under his command?—but because of the burden which descends upon his soul, the thought of the calamities which the command of the gods will bring upon Italy. At this moment lightning is seen accompanied by thunder, the sound of trumpets is heard, weapons gleam in a red light. He recognizes in the heavenly prodigy the sign of Venus and the weapons promised by his divine mother, but he does not speak of tri-

umph and victory and the fulfilment of his mission, now granted by the help of the gods. He gives expression to the pain that takes possession of him. The grave losses that the Italians and Trojans will suffer appear before his eyes, the terrible slaughter that is to come, the Tiber, which will carry away the corpses, like the Trojan stream whose image haunted his mind during the storm at sea (8. 539). The terrible image of war, that has lived in his memory since Troy, will become real again. This idea of war coming again echoes the feeling of the age of Virgil, the bitter experience of the succession of wars, the experience that history repeats itself during a lifetime in its most horrible aspects. This shudder sounds from the prophecy of the Sibyl in the sixth book (6. 86) and the prophecy of the Fourth Eclogue (Loeb):

A second Tiphys shall then arise, and a second Argo to carry chosen heroes; a second warfare, too, shall there be and again shall a great Achilles be sent to Troy.

And in all these passages there is something of the horror of the verses of the *Georgics* (1. 505-506; Loeb):

For here are right and wrong inverted; so many wars overrun the world, so many are the shapes of sin. . . .

And the experience of the horrors of the war is accompanied by an almost painful yearning for peace: Virgil is really, as Gino Funaioli called him, the poet of peace.

But the greatness of Aeneas lies in the fact that, in spite of the yearning for peace, in spite of the deep sympathy with the sufferings to come, he is ready to fulfil the command of fate. Characteristic is the way in which he gives expression to his readiness: "Now let them call for battle, and break treaties." He is ready for struggle, but not for aggression. The others have to take the first step. In battle,

too, he never takes the initiative, and when he sees the face of his young enemy Lausus pale in death, he sighs deeply and gives his hand to the dying. He eases his death, promising to leave him his weapons and to bury him with honors. With his own hand he raises the dead from the soil: *terra subleuat ipsum*. . . . So in the *Iliad* Menelaos lifts up his young friend Patroklos, a gesture seen in the sculpture in the Loggia dei Lanzi (B. Schweitzer, *Die Antike*, 1938); and on a sarcophagus Achilles raises his enemy Penthesilea (Maréchal, *Mélanges offerts à Ernout*, 1940), atoning for his cruelty by this gesture of love. But in the *Aeneid* it is not the friend who does this service of love to the friend, and not the hero in whom the feeling of passionate love awakes, but the man who considers the enemy a human being; some of this is to be found in the encounter between Achilles and Priam in the *Iliad*. Of a friend dying for his friend the poet says (9. 430): *infelicem nimum dilexit amicum*. It is not by chance that this recalls the *quoniam dilexit multum* of the Gospel of Luke (7. 47). It is the guilt of all the characters of the *Aeneid* that they love too much.

The figure of the hesitating, suffering, sympathizing Aeneas who is full of pain and charity might not seem a splendid one, and the romantic poet Leopardi called him the opposite of a hero. But if we try to understand his true nature, his steadfast consciousness of law, his feeling of responsibility, his humility before god and his mission, then even today his figure will radiate. Virgil in the impressionable years of his youth had seen times of boundless infringement of law and boundless suffering. From this he conceived his hero as an ideal that was needed. He created new patterns of being a hero, patterns going beyond

Homer and preparing the arrival of the Christian world. The *Aeneid* is not only a synthesis of antiquity but a preparation and foretaste of a new system of values, a bridge, a turning-point.

This is true also of the achievement of Virgil in the history of poetry, which cannot be separated from his significance in the history of the mind. We must ask: what part does Virgil play in Western poetry? What new, artistic, poetic devices did he give to Western poetry? I believe it can be shown that Virgil brought something new indeed. He made even a revolutionary artistic discovery. I should like to show this by the *Aeneid*.

It is customary to call the *Aeneid* an epic, but it is certain that in comparison with Homer it represents a quite new form of epic. Here one might see confirmed the view of Benedetto Croce, who maintained that there never was such a thing as a genre. That, of course, is exaggerated. But it is true that each great poet changes the genre. It is equally true that it is extremely hard to find a pure genre and an example that really conforms to the rules stated by the critic. (For my part, I cannot see that the epic of Homer really conforms to the rules given by Emil Staiger in his excellent book, *Grundbegriffe der Poetik* [2nd ed., Zürich, 1951]). This is particularly true of the epic.

The *Aeneid* contains epic, dramatic and lyric elements. First, it is an epic, of course, representing past events in narrative form. It is an epic also because the parts of the poem show a certain independence. From the biography of Donatus we know that Virgil read the second, the fourth and the sixth books of the *Aeneid* to Augustus, each on one day. These songs could be enjoyed independently. But on the

whole this principle does not hold. On the contrary, it is not the principle of the independence of the parts that rules, but of their function. The *Aeneid* is ruled by the law of rigid unity. This principle in its essence is more dramatic than epic. The dramatic law of suspense dominates the whole narrative. The victory of Aeneas and behind it the *pax Augusta* is the goal of the poem and the goal of Roman history.

In the composition of the *Aeneid* a unity is attained that differs from the Homeric poems. The *Aeneid* is divided in the following ways. *First*, 6 times 2 books: the odd books—1, 3, 5, etc.—are the less tragic ones; the even books, the tragic ones, the books in which Aeneas, the suffering hero, proves himself. *Second*, 2 times 6: 1-6, wanderings; 7-12, war (the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*). *Third*, 3 times 4: books 1-4, 5-8 and 9-12 form three units complete in themselves. In the first third, the scene is Carthage, although books 2 and 3 carry the narrative of Aeneas back to the end of Troy and the wanderings of the Trojans. Books 5-8 bring the contact with Sicily, the temple of Apollo in Cumae, Latium, the site of Rome, Etruria: the contact with Italy in various places. Books 9-12 deal with the struggles in Italy. Books 1-4 have a homogeneous setting, and so have books 9-12; in 5-8 the setting changes.

The first third contains the Odyssean trials of Aeneas, the wanderings and the great temptation by Dido as the culmination, the most perilous of his errors. The last third, 9-12, contains the Iliadic trials, the struggles and the duel with the most dangerous enemy, Turnus, again as the culminating end. These two sets of books which form the framework are the books whose model is Homer in many scenes and images. But the middle third, 5-8, the heart of the poem, brings before us the splendor



of Rome and the splendor of Italy: book 5, the contests in which the unbroken strength of Trojan youth proves itself and—in the middle of the book—the *ludus Troiae*; 6, the glorious pageantry of Roman heroes; 7, the bright catalogue of the Italian nations which are to fight against Aeneas, but partake in the glory of Rome in the Augustan view of history; 8, the triumph of Augustus, represented on the shield of Aeneas. In the central books, the development of events, in spite of all the dramatic episodes, is more calm than in the books forming the framework. Here in the center the Roman subject-matter, the unhomeric, is revealed. From this center the framework—the fortune of Aeneas and of those who are involved in his fate—receives splendor and meaning.

These three principles of division permeate one other, creating the marvelous architecture of the epic, a harmonic unity, which cannot be compared with the structure of the Homeric epic. Here we are concerned with Roman-Italic composition. The art of composition which permeates Virgil's poem is akin to the composition of Roman architecture as it appears first and very impressively in the age of Sulla in the Temple of Fortuna at Praeneste. This temple became known as the result of bombardment during the last war. With the multiplicity of its buildings and terraces and with its manifest and hidden relationships, with its surprisals, this temple presents something new in the history of Western architecture.

In Virgil the principles of classic composition and of classic form appear for the first time in poetry. These aesthetic principles are the same as those described by Heinrich Wölfflin for the classic art of the Renaissance. In the *Aeneid* the bright center of the poem is framed by units ruled by the dark col-

ors of the tragic, containing in changing settings the sufferings of war and sea. The First Eclogue is determined by the same rhythm: dark-bright-dark. The unhappy fortune of the shepherd, doomed to leave his native country, dominates the beginning and the end. With his fate contrasts the happiness of the other shepherd, who under the shadow of the beech plays a tune in praise of his beloved. The middle of the eclogue is occupied by his trip to Rome and by praise of the divine youth who gave him this happiness. The Second Eclogue shows the same principle of composition. The despair of Corydon is the framework for the courting of his beloved, which soars to paradisiac images. In both eclogues the end is enveloped in darkness, but this darkness is softened by the peace of evening, the human kindness of Tityrus receiving Meliboeus in his cottage for the night, by the sympathetic words of the poet to the unhappy Corydon.

The Tityrus Eclogue as well as the *Aeneid* or the *Georgics* is a model for a composition by contrasts: the values of the eclogue fall into symmetrical and contrasting patterns, like happiness and calamity, the calm of the shepherd world and the troubles of politics, the seclusion of a universe illuminated by music and poetry and the expulsion to unknown countries, the small world of the shepherds and the city of Rome and the immense scope of far nations included in the Roman Empire during Virgil's age, home and homelessness, departure and return; all these are contrasts that we feel to be complementary contrasts. Such an arrangement in contrasts is not only dictated by a musical need, by aesthetic principles, but conceals a view of the world. Brightness and darkness, happiness and calamity, spirit and passion join in a higher harmony, an order, resting on the adjust-

ment of the opposites. The poet knows about cosmic and historical connections in which the opposites join in a higher whole, a balance, which loses and re-establishes itself time and again.

No less we find in Virgil the relaxed tension typical of classical art. Tityrus lies *lentus in umbra*. This classical art which appears in Virgil cannot be separated from Italian *humanitas*, holding at its command the human art of softening all the dreadful and the dark, of subduing it, of transfiguring it. The conception of art as a healing power, a consolation, is determined by the deep impulse to make life happier by art. The music of Tityrus and his hospitality spring from the same deep feeling of humanity. They show in a pure and intense symbol what poetry can mean to those who suffer.

Another classic principle in Virgil is the tendency to the Universal and Typical. Underlying the Tityrus Eclogue there is a general fate: the distribution of land for the veterans of Philippi and the expulsion of thousands of farmers, peasants and lords from their possessions. A poet could have described an individual fate. But Virgil represents his personal fate and that of his countrymen not as an individual one but as a typical one. He removes it into the pastoral world, as in the *Aeneid* he removes the fate and the greatness of Rome and the Augustan age into the world of mythology. We might speak about idealization, but that term does not fit the Virgilian and the Italian feeling for form. Virgil is convinced of finding in the pastoral world—as in the rural sphere of the *Georgics* and in the mythical universe of the Homeric age—a universe more simple, more natural, purer and more human, than the universe of his time.

In Virgil the Italian feeling for form has taken hold of poetry. But earlier it

had appeared in Roman architecture and in the prose of Cicero. In later times we have this Italic classic form in the Italian architecture and painting of the Renaissance and in the classic Viennese music of Haydn and Mozart, owing so much to the Italian feeling of form and bearing witness at the same time to a deep humanity. The analogy of music matters even more for Virgil than the analogy of the visual arts. For by its essence music is nearer to the art of words than are painting and architecture: like poetry, it displays its power in time. And it is especially near to the eminently musical art of Virgil, to his musical form of composition, to the lyric element in his poetry. With this we have touched upon one of the most important features of the poetry of Virgil. His poetry realized for the first time in antiquity a lyric style in a modern sense, if we leave out of consideration Sappho, who seems to come near to the lyricism of Virgil, and Catullus, who is the forerunner of Virgil in this respect too. But Catullus' epyllion of Peleus and Thetis shows that he is far from reaching the musical perfection of Virgil. A modern lyric poem is characterized by unity of image, music and feeling. The poetic images and the music of the verse express above all a certain mood. This lyric mood is closely linked with the phenomena of memory and hope. Memory and hope give things mood, color intensity.

The attitude of Aeneas is determined by the fact that he is a man filled with memory; the memory of Troy, above all, and the hope to find a new home. Hope, on the other hand, is the deepest impulse of the existence of Anchises: he waits for the coming of his son Aeneas, counting the time, *tempora dinumerans*—what a touching expression, very simple, very human, and yet



never expressed before in Greek or Latin poetry, as far as I know. The moment when memory reaches a climax of intensity is the moment of departure. Some of the most moving scenes in the *Aeneid* are scenes of departure, and they are sometimes linked together. So the departure of Aeneas and Dido in the middle of book 4 and the other final departure in the center of book 6. The First Eclogue is a poem of departures, too. It receives its beauty and its fascinating intensity from the shepherd, who has to leave his country, and his pain is reflected in the animal world by the she-goat which has to leave her two kids born during the flight—another departure. The world of the animals reflects on a lower level the world of man; man and nature are linked together by a deep sympathy. This deep sympathy is the root of Virgil's lyricism; and this is not merely a human quality of Virgil but also his Stoic belief in the Sympathy of the world.

A poem of Virgil is a sequence of lyric moods, a perpetual movement, gradually changing, gradually increasing and diminishing its intensity. The movement of mood, of feeling in Virgil, as in each lyric poem or lyric passage, can be described as a movement of waves, a going up and down, an alternation of crescendos and decrescendos, of light darkening to deep shadow and shadow clearing up to brightness. The whole poem is a big flowing movement, and everything told fits this inner movement.

The solid factual coherence between the things of the world and human existence, on which rests the universe of Homer and still that of Greek tragedy, has been replaced in Virgil by a coherence of feelings. For the first time we find this lyricism in the pastoral poetry of Virgil, in a perfection

not reached before and not surpassed in the frame of Roman poetry. Nothing is more miraculous in the history of poetry. The achievement of Virgil can be compared to the achievement in painting ascribed by the Spanish critic Ortega y Gasset to the discovery of chiaroscuro, especially in Velasquez. The old painters, so he argues, including those of the Renaissance, painted pictures seen from nearby. They are fond of the solid body, painted with a "tactile look." But with the painters of chiaroscuro, a new matter intrudes into the elements of the pictures. This magic matter is light, which dominates the whole composition. What light has been since then for painting—feeling, mood, inner musical movement have been since Virgil for poetry. As light changes and transfigures the objects of painting, feeling changes and transfigures the objects of the poetic representation. Homer and most of the Greek poets are associated, as it were, with the older painters painting their subject matter with the "hand," the "tactile tightness of look."

How could Virgil make this discovery? As with all manifestations of genius, we are faced here with a question not to be answered clearly. The great poets are, like all great artists, discoverers of provinces in the realm of the human soul. Each artistic discovery is a liberation of slumbering forces. Of course, there was an extreme sensitiveness in Virgil. The discovery of the atmospheric element, the mood element, in poetry may be connected with a phenomenon appearing in Pompeian painting: the joy in atmosphere, in the "painterly" element, clearly separated from the achievement of Greek painting.

But above all this entrance of the lyric into poetry gives voice to a deep change in man. It announces the intense

introspection leading to Christianity. The change of form—the immense step made by Virgil from the plastic-tactile to the painterly-musical, from factualism to symbolism, from epic to lyric, is only another aspect of the change in man. So the poet Virgil, formed by the experience of civil war, which as a “trauma” determined his inner life, discovered a new realm of soul, from which a healing force can radiate in our time, too. That Virgil can play a part in our culture results from the fact that he embodies an important moment in Western history, the moment when man by the contact with Hellenic thought passed beyond it. The work of Virgil—still factual and yet transparent, still devoted to the ideals of honor and glory and yet subject to the values of love and pain, still praising and transfiguring the order of

Roman law and Roman custom, Roman religion, the Roman Empire, and yet in the service of a transcendent task—the work of Virgil is a symbol of the great moment between the ages, between the ancient and the modern order. Originated at the great turning-point—*tanto cardine rerum*—it is achievement and promise at the same time. As long as our civilization exists, it will be a model, in the sense that great works can be models. It is not to be imitated in mere repetition, but to be assimilated and to be transferred into our existence in a very different age, when our best minds long to go back to the great moments of our history, to the sublime images in which we recognize our souls, souls that we must and shall preserve in spite of the increasing menace.

Universität Heidelberg

# THE FORUM

editor MARGARET M. FORBES

## GREEK THROUGH DIFFICULTIES

*A paper presented at the Southern Section Meeting of CAMWS, 1960.*

I HAVE a rather unusual experiment to report to you—that of a Greek class in Sunday School. Ever since I have been associated with my present church, there has been a heavy demand (from one person) that I organize a Greek class. Extremely dubious of the outcome, I resisted the pressure until last year, when I was engaged in teaching the discussion type of class in which platitudes flowed freely and the same topics came round approximately every four weeks. I decided that I was accomplishing little and that I should at least try to teach something for which I was far better prepared.

In November, 1959, after a few weeks of advertising, the Greek class met for the first time. For want of other space, we met in the church kitchen, surrounded by a hundred singing children on one side, a screaming nursery class on the other, and (apparently) a herd of elephants overhead. The group as first assembled numbered about fifteen, consisting of two school teachers, assorted housewives and businessmen, and one rather precocious junior high school girl. One great handicap to recruitment was that many potential members were already engaged in teaching other classes from which they could not be released.

The class has since dwindled to ten, with obvious misfits falling by the wayside rather early. One of the enrollees managed to tumble from a ladder and break his leg the week after our sessions began. He was naturally accused of taking the easy way out.

An alternate title for this paper was "Greek Without Study," a title which describes the true nature of the class. I entered the course expecting very little study from the students, and my expectations were entirely too high. Attendance has been sporadic for reasons of illness and out-of-town business trips. Worse still is the lack of motivation of the sort possible in a regular college class. Forty-five minutes a week would be little enough even with

several hours of outside preparation; but unfortunately the two who have the best backgrounds and could profit most from the class, the school teachers, are the very ones who have no time whatever for preparing lessons. Some study is done, mostly by my wife (who is one of the students) and by one or two others.

With these handicaps, how could I best conduct the class in order to derive the most benefit, even if our ultimate goal of reading the New Testament in Greek were never reached? Obviously a traditional grammar book was not to be considered. I began with vocabulary taught through etymology, using for this purpose five dittoed sheets of words with English derivatives taken from the first twelve chapters of *Matthew*. Progress was fairly rapid through the nouns and adjectives, but much slower through the verbs, which are not nearly so well suited to derivation as are Latin verbs. Prefixes and suffixes, vowel gradation, consonant changes, word relationship and word building within Greek were all treated in great detail.

After two months of enjoyment with words, it was finally necessary to do something about grammar. The "something" turned out to be a condensed Greek grammar (two pages) which I dittoed and distributed. After a quick survey of Greek morphology we took our Westcott and Hort texts and began reading.

A list of irregular verbs quickly made its appearance, and another sheet, devoted to infinitives and participles alone, was urgently needed but never reached the printing stage because of the crush of other spring activities. The early stages of reading in *Matthew* consisted entirely of identifying in Greek the already known elements of the King James version, a practice which continues far too long in my advanced New Testament classes in college. Our reading has now progressed to the point where we can cover roughly half a chapter in one lesson, but it still involves a "pull" technique, in which I am forced to offer a steady flow of helps and hints to steer the class in the right direction.

The class opens with a reading in unison

of the Lord's Prayer in Greek, and very recently we began closing with a Greek benediction. These constitute our only oral Greek with the exception of my reading aloud of the passage to be translated. Accents have had to go by the board, except for some very elementary differentiation between the interrogative and indefinite forms.

The lack of any restrictions in terms of material to be covered has permitted flights of fancy not possible otherwise. We have touched upon the history of the alphabet, pointed out losses of initial and intervocalic sigmas and digammas, and discussed general Indo-European linguistics, showing many cognates in Latin, English and Sanskrit.

In this height of unorthodoxy some pedagogical principles have come to light, principles which had only suggested themselves to me in a more traditional approach. First, nouns are the easiest thing about Greek. It is perfectly amazing to me how well one can handle a Greek noun, knowing virtually nothing about its declension. Adjectives offer no more difficulty than nouns, but pronouns, especially the personals, require constant attention. Some bones of contention, such as the multiplicity of *autós*, are really easier than the grammars would have us believe.

The big *skándalon*, as anyone could probably surmise, is the Greek verb. Even here, some basic principles should be emphasized from the very beginning. For example, the intricacies of augmenting and de-augmenting should be driven home immediately. If these are understood, all verbs except the completely irregular can be found in the lexicon. Most of the indicatives and subjunctives can be located, and even the infinitives and third person imperatives can usually be recognized. Second person imperatives are a constant headache, and participles have remained a thorn in the flesh. The frequency of occurrence of Greek participles can be observed in any author, but it seems to me that Matthew was particularly addicted to their use. Their very frequency, however, has been a great aid to our learning, so that we are now at the point where few forms consistently stall us.

The basic difference between paradigm teaching and recognition teaching can best be illustrated here. Active participles are identified by the *-nt-* element occurring in many forms, but not in the nominative singular masculine. Therefore the first form of the paradigm becomes the last form to be learned by recognition.

Irregular verbs, of which the list can be

endless, gave me a few surprises. The sheet I prepared contained many of my favorites, but some of them have been worked to death, and others have not yet appeared. If I could be absolutely sure that the students knew a list of about five verbs, headed by *érchomai* and *hórdo*, I believe they could understand a large part of Matthew. Most *-mi* verbs, once the present reduplication was understood, have not presented serious problems. In fact, only one of them, *aphie-mi*, has caused much trouble, but it has made up for the ease of some others.

Greek syntax has proved simpler than morphology. The tenses and moods of the verb usually come out in some proximity to their real meaning. Participles are taken in stride and even the genitive absolute is beginning to break into daylight. Idioms slow the pace considerably, and some of the prepositional phrases require more explanation than indirect discourse or purpose clauses. We have not attempted some of the finer distinctions, such as the various types of conditional sentences.

I certainly cannot advocate haphazard methods like these for a regular college Greek class, but I do believe that teaching in such a situation can be very instructive. Greek and Latin elementary texts mostly operate on the assumption that all forms are of equal value, but selective emphasis could greatly speed the learning process. It is interesting to note that in the past year there has appeared a book entitled *Teach Yourself New Testament Greek*, by D. F. Hudson. It begins with a list of words with obvious derivatives and proceeds to offer a minimum of grammar based on needs for reading.

Where will my experiment lead? I must confess that I am not sure. As the class enters its second year, we still have most of our original number with the exception of one of the housewives, who has switched her attention from Greek to multiplication. I am willing to continue with this group one more year. In that time I have little hope of producing any Greek scholars, but I do expect them to be able to read at least the Gospels with some facility. Furthermore, they should be able to study a lexicon in the case of words they find especially interesting, and they should have some understanding of the many Greek words found in all Bible commentaries.

Is there any real value in a class of this sort? Since we have begun our study I have been forced to hear even more frequently that most atrocious of comments, "It's all Greek to me!", accompanied by a roar of laughter, and to answer the sincere ques-

tion, "What in the world does Greek have to do with church?" Comments of this type come from people who believe that if the King James language was good enough for St. Paul it is good enough for them. I see it as but one infinitesimal attempt to prove my favorite thesis that everyone who studies the New Testament should know Greek, and to combat the swelling tide of ministers who know none whatever. Finally, it serves the purpose of any Biblical Greek class, that of freeing minds chained by a dogmatic interpretation of every passage in the Bible. Furthermore I have proved, at least to my own satisfaction, that an ordinary individual, with no special aptitude for scholarly pursuits, can derive some pleasure and benefit from the study of Greek.

Much favorable publicity has come of the project. Both within and without the church there are continual questions from interested persons and consequently opportunities for me to spread my Gospel of Greek. The daily newspaper published a very thorough account of our activities. In our area, at least, the project seems to be a unique one, but I am sure that something of the sort has been tried elsewhere. I should like very much to hear of anyone else who has taught Greek in church and the result of his attempt. I do not know if I shall ever find the opportunity, or the energy, to begin another class, but I must say that I have just finished my most unusual, most challenging, and most enjoyable church year.

J. D. SADLER

Furman University

### A CHAIN REACTION

THE WHOLE THING started when our Latin classes began reading about Greece in their textbooks. Their keen appreciation aroused in our teenagers a desire to work up a series of projects on the subject. The Parthenon and other temples inspired would-be architects to soap sculpture. Others worked on costumes of the era, and puppets were dressed as Greek or Roman belles, gay blades in togas or chitons, and sturdy centurions and hoplites. Book reports, brief biographies, posters and other articles completed our collection, and the various objects were placed on display in the classroom.

The HS supervisor, accompanied by one of the county superintendents visited us

and invited us to exhibit the projects at the main office of the Board of Education, located in a neighboring town. Other schools were also invited to take part. Two accepted and contributed especially interesting posters and models of war machines among other materials. The *tormenta*, made from kits, were excellent.

We were surprised and truly delighted to observe the interest shown by the entire personnel at the office. One principal who happened to come in was seen in serious conversation with the man in charge of the maintenance crew, explaining that the ballistas, catapults, etc., were really the ancestors of our atomic missiles.

A further boost was supplied by the request that we leave the exhibit there until after the meeting of the Board of Education the following week. Most gratifying was the commendation of the superintendent who had issued the invitation. He considered the exhibit a very worthwhile project in furthering good public relations; and reported that the models had received much curious attention from the younger people and very intelligent inspection from adults who had visited the office. Several teachers and administrators had studied the display and had asked for the sources of certain materials, with the idea of adapting some of them to their own use.

Thus encouraged, we will aim higher in the future, and try to secure the participation of many other schools in the country. It has been suggested that friendly competition might be set up within the county if special recognition were given for superior achievement. Too, we might wish to explore the feasibility of changing the type of display, perhaps attempting a style show, or aspiring to a playlet on TV.

Thus you see the chain reaction of happy circumstances: an imaginary visit to Greece led to special student activity; this attracted administrative attention and public interest; and finally, recognition for the values of foreign language study, especially of Latin, may be termed the end result.

ELEANOR JENNINGS

Beaver H.S.  
Bluefield, West Virginia

### SOME PROBLEMS

*Timely words from a high-school counselor given at the CAMWS meeting in Athens:*

THE TITLE of my paper "Some Problems



Relevant to the Study of Latin in the High School" might more properly be "Some Problems Relevant to the Study of Latin in My High School," for I have written my paper for the viewpoint of my own situation. However, I find it difficult to believe that mine is a situation which is wholly atypical, particularly in Georgia, and, no doubt, elsewhere.

High-school Latin teachers are pleased, I am sure, to know that this organization is interesting itself in problems of the high schools. Certainly neither the high-school teacher nor the college professor can afford to be unconcerned regarding problems related to the study of Latin at either the high-school or college level. We should need no Menenius Agrippa to point out to us our dependence upon each other. We are definitely experiencing a crisis in our common area of interest today which we must plan together to circumvent. I shall attempt to apprise you of the situation as I have experienced it in our high school.

But first I should like to point out that problems related to Latin in our Georgia high schools are by no means all of the disheartening variety. One of our problems is indeed a most encouraging one.

Our State Board of Education in July, 1957, which date, you will note, antedates both Sputnik and NDEA, made it mandatory that all state-accredited high schools make available to students at least two-years study of one foreign language. As Latin has always been a favorite among foreign languages in Georgia high schools, the effect of this ruling was an unprecedented increase in the number of classes in the schools of the state. But the lack of qualified teachers was thereby intensified. Dr. Gordon Brown, our State Consultant for Foreign Languages, told me of one teacher whose professional preparation for teaching Latin consisted of two years of high-school Latin. You see, in Georgia, teachers are required to be certified, at this time, in only the area of the major portion of their teaching assignments.

Of course the teacher I have just mentioned is an extreme and, fortunately, isolated case, but there are varying degrees of lack of preparation among our Latin teachers. In order to remedy this situation, some of our colleges have set up summer courses designed for strengthening Latin teachers, and our State Board of Education provided \$300 grants-in-aid to encourage teachers to improve their qualifications. Thus this problem is, to an extent, being met.

Yet in the high schools there are certain

other perplexing problems that have not been so realistically faced, perhaps because there is, unfortunately, no easy solution. One of these problems arises from the fact that Latin is not a subject toward which many high-school students naturally gravitate today. Not having been steeped in, nor even much exposed to, the concept of Western Civilization and the part ancient Romans had in developing ideas that have influenced our language, thought and living today, they lack the interest which might generate curiosity about the language, thought and life of those ancients. In fact the Romans are to many of the students entering high school today, a kind of pre-historic people. I have had cause to suspect that our efforts in eighth-grade English classes to help students become acquainted with the myths and legends of the Romans, in order that they may more intelligently comprehend and appreciate the many evidences of these in our culture, result in a feeling that Rome and the Romans themselves are indeed mythological and legendary.

In our present era of pragmatism, with practicality and its handmaiden expediency setting the standard of values, the high-school student can be "sold" Latin only from the practical point of view. Of course we know that there is a very practical point of view to offer, but it fails to satisfy students who are afflicted with our national mania for a quick, handsome return on investments. Were Latin required for graduation, the student would accept its inclusion on his schedule as he does English, social science, math and natural science — never giving a thought, I regret to add, as to why it's required, knowing only that he must have it. He has been convinced that graduation is important, though I doubt that many students are fully aware of why graduation is important. Some seem to consider graduation merely a kind of hurdle they are expected to pass over before they go to college or take certain jobs. Graduation is required, so to speak, but an education is not. Of course, the one was originally synonymous with the other; however, with our modern acceptance that there are many educations to which one may aspire, the term "education" has lost its definition and has acquired such vagueness that the term "graduation," once signifying that the graduate was to a certain degree educated, now has for most high-school students, and some of their parents, the significance of a chronologically arrived-at social event, something like the debutante's "coming-out" ball.

How can the study of Latin be expected

to thrive in an atmosphere where the usual student no longer is disposed to striving? He has arrived at high school, for the most part, without any appreciable striving. He has been encouraged in following that which interests him, fleeting though his interests often are. He seems to have capitalized on this fleeting aspect in his interests; thereby he avoids the necessity of having to meet the more exacting standards met in the pursuit of any objective beyond its elemental stages. The Latin teacher can hardly fight a winning battle for Latin unless he is supported by others of the faculty in fighting for it.

Of course a demand for Latin from the school community could stem the tide or rather, in this case, the ebb. Despite the multiple odds already mentioned which were against the possibility of such a demand materializing, the demand was brought about in the following manner.

With the excellent help of a fine group of students, the Latin Club was organized as one of the activity groups in our school. It appealed to the social-mindedness of our boys and girls and afforded Latin publicity which became the basis of a good public-relations program. The PTA, which is well attended by both fathers and mothers, sought the Club's help on programs. The Club's activities were publicized in our school publication and occasionally made the local newspaper. The following year we affiliated at state and national levels with the Junior Classical League and sent a sizable delegation to the JCL State Convention. Two years later we made a successful bid for the honor of hosting the State Convention, which some 400 people attended. There were items in the school, local and Atlanta papers. The latter ran two fine feature articles, replete with pictures. We were excited by an inquiry from *Life* magazine. Latin had really come to the forefront in our school and community.

Meanwhile, through the Club, named "Rome," an acoustic for "Romans of the Modern Era," we were observing Latin Week each April at our school with particular emphasis on attracting students to the study of Latin. Through these efforts, we have doubled enrollment in the Latin classes, far more than might be attributed to the increased enrollment of the school.

Five years ago, our Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction and Curriculum, incidentally a Latin scholar and former Latin teacher, was visiting my second-year class. On leaving, he astonished me by asking why we were not offering advanced courses in Latin. I had not realized

that I might encourage students to ask for third- and fourth-year Latin. Two years later we were offering a combination class of alternating Cicero and Vergil, not usually found now in a public high school of our enrollment, about 800. Then I was asked to undertake the duties of counselor. Thus another is enjoying that full teaching-schedule of Latin classes, the most cherished dream of many high-school Latin teachers.

However, as counselor I have a unique opportunity in our guidance program of assisting students in gaining insight regarding the advantages of studying Latin and am able to help them plan how best to handle the scheduling boobytraps built into the requirements for graduation in our academic program. Last year we had our first graduate with four years of Latin, and we are very proud this year of a young lady who will graduate not only with four years of Latin, but also with three years of Spanish, a double-major in languages. By the way, she is in need of a substantial scholarship. We hope to be able to encourage more such double-majors in language.

Now that our Fulton County School System is allowing certain eighth-grade students entering with advanced standing to start Latin a year earlier than usual, it may be expected that the advanced classes in Latin will be less tormented, as far as these advanced students are concerned, with the scheduling intricacies experienced by others in enrolling for Latin.

We teachers in the high schools need the help of our colleagues in Latin at the college level. Students must be encouraged to continue their study of Latin. Particularly must we co-operate to continue in Latin those who plan to teach. It caused me no little chagrin to learn that my four-year student graduating last year was unable to schedule Latin the past fall at one of our outstanding universities. She was too advanced for what was offered. She is doing exceptionally well in German classes and is hoping to study Russian. However, this will, no doubt, result in the loss of a potentially good Latin teacher.

Somehow our efforts must be better coordinated. There must be communication between the high-school and college teachers of Latin. I am told that in Georgia we enjoy the fraternizing of high-school and college teachers of foreign languages more than in most states. Opportunity for this is afforded in our Georgia Education Association through its Classical and Modern Foreign Language Association, which I served as president the past three years. Latin teachers in Georgia are greatly in-



debted to Dr. James Alexander and his former colleague Dr. Robert E. Wolverton for the interest and leadership they have given the high school program.

With the emphasis that has been thrown upon modern foreign languages by the National Defense Education Act of 1957 and the accompanying glamour of expensively equipped language laboratories further beguiling the student in search for learning without effort, Latin enrollments may soon be showing a marked decline, in contrast to the phenomenal growth in recent years. What the impact of the growing elementary school programs of modern foreign-language instruction will be on the Latin enrollments in high schools remains to be seen. Perhaps Latin, if it survives, will be moved to the junior and senior level. It may be that the concern of some principals in regard to finding qualified Latin teachers will soon be obviated by a diminishing demand for Latin. We may be not very far from the day when the study of Latin, as that of Greek, will be available, for the most part, only in our larger colleges and universities. I, for one, shall rue the day when young minds of high-school students are denied the privilege of becoming intimately acquainted with the intellectually stimulating language and literature of the ancient Romans.

Latin teachers of the high schools invite the interest and concern of members of this and other such groups in our nation. Truly, for the assurance of the inclusion of Latin in the curricula of most of our high schools, the trite expression "It is later than you think!" has for us a disquieting poignancy.

IDUS D. FELDER

College Park H.S.  
Georgia

#### FROM OUR READERS

THIS LETTER is in response to your invitation (CJ 56 [1960] 115) to comment on Sister Mary Ethel's letter regarding the principal parts of Latin verbs.

As for the first person singular present indicative as one of the principal parts, she is completely right in discarding it, and for more reasons than she states. In the first place, it contributes nothing to the student's information about the verb except for the comparatively few -to verbs and some irregulars like *esse* and *posse*. And most of the forms of the irregulars are best learned individually anyway. Other-

wise *servo* and *laudo*, *habeo* and *maneo*, *duco* and *peto*, *audio* and *venio* and all other such verbs are invariably predictable from their imperfective infinitives. Why then learn the equivalent of both "I write" and "to write" for every Latin verb?

As a matter of fact, learning the first person singular of the present is not only useless; it is an outright handicap. We all know by personal experience as well as by observation of our students that the first in order of the principal parts is the only one we are always sure of. Even in English, few can continue without hesitation beyond "bring," "sing," "wing," "wring" and their kin. So in Latin: is it *servio*, *servire*, or *servio*, *servere*? Does *paro* continue as *parare* or *parere*? Should *abeo* be followed by *abere* or *abire*? In a word, the present first singular is not only not useful, but actually deceptive. But if the student is spared this form, he will at least be safe on *parere*, *parare* and the like, whether or not he can continue with *peperi*, *partus* and *paravi*, *paratus*; and his load of principal parts will be reduced by almost 25 per cent. I strongly suspect that there never was a real reason for learning the present first singular. Most probably, since the Romans learned formal grammatical study from the Greeks, and in Greek the present first singular is an essential principal part, the Romans simply adopted this habit mechanically, without inquiring whether it had any value. In any case, it is high time to abandon it; and for the past ten years I have forbidden my students to learn the present first singular as a principal part except for -io verbs. Even with these my students put the imperfective infinitive first: *fugere*, *fugio* (or simply -io), *fugi*, *fugiturus*.

What to do about the active perfective stem is less of a problem, since either the first singular or the infinitive leads to the same result. *Putavisse*, *vidisse*, *misisse* and so on have the advantage of paralleling the form of the preceding principal part; *putavi*, *vidi*,  *misi* diverge less from what the student will find in every vocabulary and dictionary now in print.

On the question of the last principal part, however, I am not sure that I agree so well with Sister Mary Ethel. Even the use of the supine does not result in complete uniformity, for there are verbs (*esse* is an example) which have a "future" participle but no supine. More importantly, there seems to me to be some value in learning the perfective participle (in -us, -a, -um) for verbs which have such a form, and the supine for verbs which have one but lack

the perfective participle. It can be argued that this distinction is immaterial for a reading knowledge of Latin, since Roman authors can be trusted to use the proper forms and not attribute participles to verbs which do not possess them; but this appears to be a small and short-sighted view of our function as teachers of a language. Surely one of our duties is to give the beginning student some of the basic concepts of linguistics and to impart at the same time some clear notions of the structure of Latin specifically. In the Latin verb, because the perfective participle is regularly passive (except in deponents, of course, and a few special instances such as *falsus* and *pransus*), it follows that only transitive verbs are capable of producing this form, and that by and large the difference between verbs with perfective participles and those with supines or "future" participles follows the division into transitive and intransitive. It seems a pity, then, to obscure this basic structural distinction by learning the supine for all verbs alike.

It is pleasant to see that more and more teachers are re-examining the conventional systems to which Latin has been bound for so many centuries. Some had their uses once but need change; others are still satisfactory; still others, as I have said above, never had any justification in the first place. But if we can convince ourselves that nothing in our ways of teaching is necessarily final and perfect (Why, for example, should nouns and adjectives be listed under the nominative singular, always the most misleading of all the forms? Why not by the ablative singular, which nearly always exhibits the true form of the stem, with the nominative following?), then the dead weight of the cut-and-dried will be lifted from both teachers and learners.

ROBERT O. FINK

Kenyon College

I SHOULD NOT ASK your space merely to come to the defense of Chase and Phillips, *Introduction*, but having used the book since it was in ring-binders, and having taught with a variety of grammars for Latin and four modern languages, I should be willing to say that if we are stuck with Chase and Phillips we are stuck with a comparatively excellent book. A teacher who is unwilling to use it can make the experiment I made myself, with a tiny group of volunteers, of preparing the lessons himself, but it is a task, and one which required a better con-

trol of the subject than I had, certainly, at that time.

There are flaws in the present edition, which we may expect to see amended in the revision, but my impression is that every teacher adds a few details in the margin or end papers of any beginning text. The genitive absolute needs fuller treatment. (I always use a chapter or so of the Gospels about Christmas; this supplies abundant illustration of the genitive absolute, and of aorist passives.) And the reference in Chase's "A Summary of Greek Syntax" is incorrect: page 67; not discussed, although illustrated, on p. 100. Similarly the use of the articular infinitive to express purpose is not illustrated on page 50 (the substantive uses and the genitive after a verb of preventing are illustrated. A convenient purpose infinitive is found in *Matt. 2. 13*). The semi-colon is hard to see after final *nu*. But such matters one can take care of.

One desirable feature of this book is that its readings are substantial in intellectual content from the first. Several of my students have commented on the fact that it does not say, "Today the farmers are in the field," to quote an excellent Latin grammar, nor does it discuss *la plume de ma tante*. I have heard, I admit, experienced Greek teachers alleging that they could not translate some of the sentences; at the risk of being wrong, I think that I can offer a correct rendering of each of them, though several of them are perhaps surprising. Chase and Phillips leave something to the teacher in the A. and B. sentences of the later readings. Shorey used to say, I am told, "Greek syntax is not logical, but psychological."

The teaching of beginning Greek seems to me to be to a great extent a question of what can one leave out. I am thinking of using Pharr, in the second year, to supplement Chase and Phillips and to introduce Homer. There are books for New Testament Greek *per se*, but they are inadequate for Attic; and there are British books; but the only alternative to Chase and Phillips which I should care to see would be something like our new Latin books for college use, that is to say a grammar giving a schematic survey of the structure of Greek. Such a book would be difficult to prepare, unless it were merely selected from Smyth or Goodwin and Gulick, and were barren of exercises, and where is the market for it?

May I express my gratitude to C. and P.?

KIFFIN A. ROCKWELL

Beloit College

## ORPHEUS AND EURYDICE: SOME MODERN VERSIONS

M. OWEN LEE

THE MYTH of Orpheus and Eurydice has always been one of the most popular of the classic myths. Virgil's fourth *Georgic* first immortalized it.<sup>1</sup> In later ages it became a moral lesson, in Boethius, and a romance, in the Middle English poem *Sir Orfeo*.<sup>2</sup> In the Renaissance it provided the subject for the first secular drama in a modern language, Politian's *Orfeo*.<sup>3</sup> Later it became a sort of blueprint for operatic composition, in the experiments of the Florentine Camerata and the monumental operas of Monteverdi and Gluck.<sup>4</sup> Among the German Romanticists the myth symbolized the poet's attempt to penetrate the mysteries of death<sup>5</sup>—a tradition which was inherited by Rainer Maria Rilke and many modern symbolist poets in France, England and America.<sup>6</sup>

The meaning Orpheus and Eurydice have for the men of any age is largely conditioned by the way in which that age uses myth. The myths of primitive peoples are often re-classified as myth proper (an explanation of natural phenomena), legend (the forerunner of history) and folklore (a purely imaginative narration). It is extremely diffi-

cult, however, to categorize Greek myths along these lines, as many of them partake of the nature of myth, legend and folklore at one and the same time. The story of Orpheus and Eurydice is certainly one of these. It has been assigned a number of mythical origins because of its possible connection with the Orphic mysteries, and because it fits well into the general class of underworld descent-myths which express the conflict of day and night, of summer and winter, of life and death. It was treated, even in ancient times, as legend because its hero was one of the legendary founders of Greek civilization. It can safely be classed as folklore because the climax of its action—the backward look—is a part of the folklore of the world.

Thus the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice meant at least three things to the ancient world: it symbolized the eternal struggle of elemental forces; it recounted the legendary power of a great civilizer; it told a tragic love story. Each level of myth had something to contribute to the richness of the resulting whole. And as the story continued to appear in literature, part

myth, part legend, part folklore, it came to grips with three subjects: the mystery of life and death and rebirth; the all-compelling power of poetry and song; the tragic destruction of love and beauty when human emotion is not properly controlled.

The classic treatments of the story in every age have dealt with these themes, balancing and interlaying and undercutting them, as the myth became, in turn, allegory, romance, classic drama, opera, romantic and symbolist poetry. Recently, Orpheus has invaded the liveliest arts. He has found his way to the Broadway stage and the motion picture and television screens, appearing in contemporary guise. Jean Cocteau's Orpheus walks the boulevards of Paris; Jean Anouilh's fiddles in a provincial railway station; Tennessee Williams' haunts the juke joints of Mississippi, and Marcel Camus' drives a streetcar in Rio de Janeiro. How valid, one may ask, are these new Orpheus-figures? Are any of them really related to Virgil's tragic hero? Will any of them, we wonder, stand with the Orpheus-figures of Politian and Gluck as an index to the spirit of an age?

CERTAINLY Cocteau's Orphée will give pause to many a future student of literature. He seems to owe something to the Orphée of the French symbolists: the poet who is master of the secrets of life and death. But Cocteau has complicated the figure by identifying it with himself. And in retelling Orpheus' story (on the stage in 1926 and on the screen in 1951) he has overlaid the myth with his own set of symbols.

Thus, in the opening scene of the play, Orphée is shown detecting poetic messages from the world beyond via the hoofbeats of an oracular horse which he keeps in his house. This infuri-

ates the conventional Eurydice, but to Orphée "la moindre de ces phrases est plus étonnante que tous les poèmes."<sup>7</sup> He seems to be discovering the very meaning of poetry in these messages, and one of them, "Madame Eurydice reviendra des enfers," he enters in the annual poetry competition sponsored by a local women's club called the Bacchantes.

As the play proceeds, the symbols become even more startling. Death comes to claim Eurydice; she is a beautiful young woman who issues orders to two surgeon-like assistants and a set of "infernal machines" obviously meant to suggest the operating room. She accidentally leaves her gloves behind, however, and an angel named Huertebise tells Orphée he can follow Eurydice into the next world by donning the gloves and passing through the mirror: "Je vous livre le secret des secrets. Les miroirs sont les portes par lesquelles la Mort va et vient."<sup>8</sup> In the split second it takes the postman to drop a letter in the mail box, Orphée returns with Eurydice. But he must never look on her again. When, in a quarrel, he accidentally does so, she disappears.

Orphée opens the letter and discovers that his poem "Madame Eurydice reviendra des enfers" has aroused the fury of the Bacchantes because its initial letters spell out "un mot injurieux." "Le cheval m'a joué!"<sup>9</sup> he cries, but by joyfully accepting his martyrdom, he breaks the horse's spell forever. In the closing scenes of the play, Orphée's severed head announces that his name is really Jean Cocteau, and with his wife and guardian angel Huertebise he mounts to heaven.

This outline omits hundreds of details which are undoubtedly significant to Cocteau and his following, but it should at least indicate some of the serious,

comic, analogous and scandalous levels in this modern treatment of the Orpheus myth.

In the film the horse, the poetry contest and the severed head are gone. The tone is almost unrelievedly serious. The scope of the motion picture camera enables us to enter the world beyond the mirror, and the central character seems to be less Orphée than the death-bringing young woman, who is now a Princess escorted by two motorcyclists. Huertebise is now her chauffeur, and the poetic messages from the other world come over the short-wave radio in her Rolls-Royce.

The Orphée of the film is a celebrated Parisian poet who has lost his inspiration and is seeking a fresh approach to poetry. In the opening scene, he is drinking at a sidewalk cafe when a popular young writer named Cégeste is run down and killed by the Princess and her cyclists. Both Orphée and Cégeste are carried off in the car, and Orphée learns that the young man's poetry has actually come to him through the Princess, from the world of the dead. He longs to receive the same poetic secrets, which he hears crackling over the car radio. But he awakes to find himself restored to ordinary life. Then his unloved, pregnant Eurydice is carried off by the Princess, and, as in the play, Orphée is told by Huertebise to recover her by donning the gloves and passing through a mirror. But he realizes that he is making the journey, not to regain his wife, but to renew contact with the Princess and her poetic world of death.

The judges of the world of the dead—three blue-serged businessmen—are angered that their two agents have fallen in love with mortals—the Princess with Orphée and Huertebise with Eurydice. The agents are to be punished, and Orphée may have his Eury-

dice once more, provided he never look on her again.

As the film ends, Eurydice dies a second time when Orphée accidentally glances at her image in a mirror, and Orphée is shot down by a mob of young poets, who think he is responsible for the death of Cégeste. Then, strangely enough, both of them are restored to life again: the Princess and Huertebise appear to say they are ready to die in the place of the poet and his wife. Poetry has wrung the heart of death itself.

In both the play and the film, logic and convention are scorned in an attempt to surround the story with an atmosphere of unreality—ironically achieved by the introduction of the most realistic, even mechanical devices. But the deliberate shock element of the play has been replaced, after twenty-five years, by the marvelous and the picturesque in the film. The theater audience is startled into accepting the story; the cinema audience is drawn to do so by curious, evocative images.

Cocteau's attitude towards the myth has changed as well. In the play it is the power of poetry that is central: because he is a poet, Orphée can contact the unknown regions beyond; these communicate with him in ways malevolent (the horse) and benignant (Huertebise); they bring his destruction and his apotheosis. To an extent these ideas are also present in the film, but the emphasis has switched from the poet and his powers to the world of death, which is seen no longer as contrasted good and evil, but as a terrible world which reaches out to claim its mortal victims. The true poet (Cégeste) must contact this world; the immortal poet (Orphée) must conquer it by winning its love.

These themes, the power of poetry in



the play, the mystery of death in the film, are traditionally Orphean themes. But Cocteau seems to evoke them, not through the Orpheus-Eurydice story itself, but by imposing a mythology of his own upon the classic myth. By his own admission he uses Orpheus because he feels "quite naturally drawn to a myth in which life and death meet face to face."<sup>10</sup> . . . life and death, not Orpheus and Eurydice. The mythical figures are obscured, almost submerged, in the concentration on the two worlds between which they are drawn. The details of their story, even the crucial backward glance, are irrelevant to Cocteau's purposes. They tend only to get in the way of his fantastic vision, and are fitted in carelessly and half-heartedly. Doubtless both of these works will survive as long as Cocteau himself: *Orphée* is his first important play, and the film *Orphée* is a compendium of his screen technique. But they owe less to the classic Orpheus than to Cocteau's strangely evolving sense of the theater and his fascination with the mysteries of poetry and death—themes he conveniently finds in the Orpheus myth.

ANOUILH'S PLAY *Eurydice*<sup>11</sup> retells the myth in the drab settings of a provincial French railway station and a shabby Marseilles hotel room. Orpheus and his father are itinerant musicians, and Eurydice and her mother actresses in a down-at-the-heel theater troupe. Between trains the young people meet and fall in love. They escape from their parents for a few hours, in which the whole world and all the people in it seem transformed. But the sweetness in life is impermanent: Eurydice's scandalous past pursues her; she leaves Orpheus and is killed in a street accident. Then a mysterious M. Henri (Hermes) arranges for the two to meet

again in the deserted railway station; Orpheus may win her back provided he does not look her in the face before dawn. But now Orpheus is curious about Eurydice's previous lovers. He faces her and has the truth out. Eurydice fades into the night, as all the characters in the play assemble to speak of her essential goodness. In the final scene, Orpheus is told by M. Henri that he must not hope to find happiness in this life; he must join Eurydice in death. And while his father blandly extols the crude pleasures of bourgeois society, Orpheus runs out into the night to die with Eurydice.

This is the disillusioned Anouilh of the years of the German occupation of France, savoring the sweetness of life, but convinced that it can never survive in a sordid world. The play seems to touch on two Orphean themes—the impermanence of love, the finality of death. But critics have dealt harshly with it, and on two counts; they have judged it morally shabby in its treatment of love and human relationships, and artistically unsound in its pseudo-existentialist approach to serious problems. It would seem that one Orphean theme dissolves in self-pity and the other in mawkish death-wishing. Perhaps this is because the third theme is left untapped: Orpheus' musicianship means nothing to the play. He has no hopeful, persuasive song with which to win back his Eurydice. Instead he casts his art aside and runs into the face of death. No doubt the possibility of triumph amid tragedy would not have suited Anouilh's pessimistic thesis. He may have chosen to ignore it; or he may have been unaware that the myth he was adapting was a complex of opposed but balanced mysteries. He touches on only part of the complexus—and his play is only partially successful.

TENNESSEE WILLIAMS' *Orpheus Descending*, which recently appeared on the screen as *The Fugitive Kind*, tells how a guitar player from New Orleans descends to a decadent southern town. Because he is one of "the fugitive kind . . . the kind that don't belong," he rouses the ire of the local demons, who abide by a rigidly conservative code of immorality, and he drives three local Eurydices to the diversified extremes of mysticism, nymphomania and embittered hope. In the end, the favored heroine is shot by her invalid husband, and the hero himself is burned to death by the sheriff and his chorus of brutes.

Williams' Orpheus-figure may be a valid symbol for the modern poet, who is an outsider in a hostile and uncomprehending world. He is given some expressive poetry to speak to his Eurydices, and invariably prompts the reaction, "Take me out of this hell." But this is precious little Orpheus for a play which calls itself *Orpheus Descending*, a play in which music has no power over hostile forces, love is never tested, and death means only a final curtain and an end to a succession of brutal scenes.

The Orpheus-themes are not to be found in Williams' play because *Orpheus Descending* is actually a rewrite of an early, unsuccessful work, *Battle of Angels*, which had no connection whatsoever with Orpheus. It is no credit to Williams' art that he has been able to invest an old play with "classical significance" merely by changing the title and equipping his hero with a guitar.

THE MYTH is more explicitly dealt with in another recent film, *Orpheu Negro* (*Black Orpheus*). This is a colorful work, almost a ballet, based on a play<sup>12</sup> by the Brazilian diplomat Vini-

cius de Moraes and filmed in Brazil by the French director Marcel Camus. The myth of Orpheus and Eurydice is here re-enacted by the under-privileged negroes who live by the thousands in shacks made of cast-off oil cans and perched on the steep cliffs overlooking the bay of Rio de Janeiro. Among their number is the trolley-conductor Orpheus; he it is who makes the sun rise every morning, as he sings and strums his guitar. Newly come to the settlement is a country girl named Eurydice; she is followed by a rejected lover who is intent on killing her. The harried girl meets the carefree minstrel and together they descend to Rio to dance at the carnival, he costumed as the sun and she as the night. Here amid bizarre figures and frenzied, whirling rhythms they are separated, and Eurydice is trapped in a power plant by her pursuer, who is masquerading as death. Ironically it is Orpheus who unwittingly kills Eurydice when he turns on the power switch to look for her. The hells in which Black Orpheus then seeks his lost love are the bureau of missing persons, the rituals of the Macumba sect and, finally, the morgue, where he finds her body and carries it, at dawn, through the aftermath of the carnival to his home high above the city. Here, as he sings that happiness is only an illusion, he is struck by a rock thrown by a jealous "bacchant" and, with Eurydice still in his arms, he plunges over the cliff to his death. One of the children picks up his guitar to play as the sun rises on another day.

Camus' film is most effective in its fantastic array of color, rhythm and sound. Indeed, the visual and aural rhythms seem to propel the story and sweep it on to its climax. But there is some disparity between this heady atmosphere and the fragile Greek myth. At first we warm to the discov-



ery that the handsome boy and the lovely girl are called Orpheus and Eurydice; we are impressed when Eurydice, to disguise herself from the mysterious specter who pursues her, must dress as night—for Orpheus is to dance as the sun; we even accept the accidental electrocution as a modern counterpart of Orpheus' backward glance. But as the film proceeds, the mythological details are more arbitrarily fitted in, and the context begins to resist them. Thus the caretaker of the power plant must be named Hermes; the diabolic rituals must be guarded by a ferocious dog named Cerberus; during the incantation Orpheus must be tricked into believing he hears Eurydice's voice behind him, telling him not to look back. These devices are clumsy enough, but what eventually wreaks havoc with the myth is the social commentary introduced by Camus:

One of my themes was the denunciation of apathy: apathy in religion (as shown in the religious sect of the Macumba); apathy in public office, symbolized by the advance of red-tape bureaucracy; apathy in the face of distress which rules those white hells of the hospital and the mortuary.<sup>13</sup>

While Camus has something important to say, the Orpheus myth hardly seems the appropriate vehicle in which to say it. For the myth obscures the message; instead of adding an extra dimension to the social theme, it makes abstract types of what should be sympathetic characters. And on the other hand, the message is never related to the myth; the problems of Orfeu Negro are not those of Orpheus of Thrace. The Orphean themes—the mysterious power of music over death, the problem of the control of human passion, the loss of beauty won by song—these are submerged in a swirling mass of color and then dismissed in the hard light of social indignation.

I DO NOT FEEL that any of these modern dramatists succeed in retelling the myth as completely, and as beautifully, as have Virgil or the poet of *Sir Orfeo* or Politian, Monteverdi and Gluck.

Cocteau's identification of himself with Orpheus the poet is perhaps his most powerful and durable symbol. But his *Orphée*, on both stage and screen, lacks the stuff of greatness because what it has to say about poetry and about death is irrelevant to the myth it uses: its themes and symbols are part of the mythology of Cocteau, not of Orpheus. The myth does not reveal itself in either *Orphée*; it is only a convenient vehicle for the author's flights of fancy.

Anouilh, I think, sincerely attempts to reveal the meaning he sees in the myth. If his findings are negative and defeatist, it is because he has explored only two of the myth's three themes: love is bittersweet, and death alone can give it permanence. But music and art, indeed all human endeavor, these have no place in Anouilh's pessimistic scheme of things.

Williams, like Cocteau, has a valid Orpheus-symbol. But he cannot bring the myth to life when he uses it to piece together bits and scraps of material that bears no relation to Orpheus.

Camus sounds the themes of the Orpheus myth, but in a too exotic context. And he introduces a modern commentary that applies to the context but not to the myth.

Taken together, the four modern adapters attest the abiding popularity of the myth. They also serve to illustrate the basic problem involved in making such adaptations. Any serious treatment, however modern, must grasp the sources—ritual, legendary, dramatic—of the myth it uses; it must

then present the same mysteries, ask the same questions, outline the same triumph and tragedy. It may not be gratuitous for Anouilh's Eurydice to go out for the groceries or for Williams' Orpheus to sell dry goods and mumble obscenities. These may be essential to their modern context. But they cannot substitute for insight into the myth itself. The story of Orpheus and Eurydice is more than a workable plot which may be effectively updated; it is a beautiful and powerful expression of age-old mysteries and truths. These are what gave it birth, and these no adapter can afford to ignore.

St. Michael's College  
University of Toronto

<sup>1</sup> The myth is fully treated in Verg. *Geor.* 4. 454-527, *Cul.* 267-95 and *Ov. Met.* 10. 1-78. But see also Eur. *Alc.* 357-62; Pl. *Smp.* 179d; Isoc. *Bus.* 223. 8; Hermesian. in *Ath. Deip.* 13. 597b-c; Mosch. 3. 115-26; Diod. *Sic.* 4. 25. 4; Orph. *A.* 40-42; Hor. *C.* 1. 24. 13-18, 3. 11. 15-24; Conon 45; Manil. 1. 324-27, 5. 328; Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 569-91, *Herc. Oet.* 1031-99; Luc. *Orpheus*, frags.; Stat. *Theb.* 8. 57-60; Apollod. 1. 3. 2; Plu. *De Sera Numinis* 22. 566c, *Amatorius* 17. 761e-f; Paus. 9. 30. 4-6; Luc. *DMort.* 22. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Boeth. *Consol.* 3, metrum 12 and anon. *Sir Orfeo*. Other notable treatments through the Middle Ages are Fulg. *Myth.* 3. 10; King Alfred's

translation of Boethius 35.6; *Ovide Moralisé* 10. 1-577; Guillaume de Machaut, *Confort d'ami* 2271-2674 and Robert Henryson, *Orpheus and Eurydice*.

<sup>3</sup> Other Renaissance treatments of the myth are Ronsard, *L'Orphée*; Juan de Jáuregui, *Orfeo*; and Milton, *L'Allegro* 145-50, *Il Penseroso* 105-108.

<sup>4</sup> These are Peri, Euridice; Caccini, Euridice; Monteverdi, *Orfeo*; Gluck, *Orfeo ed Euridice*. Among the many other composers who wrote operas on the subject are Lully, Haydn, Offenbach and Milhaud. There are cantatas on Orpheus by Charpentier, Rameau and Pergolesi, symphonic poems by Liszt and Hovhaness, and a ballet by Stravinsky.

<sup>5</sup> See Novalis, *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* I; Hölderlin, *Hymne an den Genius Griechenlands* 35-38; Schiller, *Nänie* 1-4. The motif is studied by Joachim Rosteutcher, *Das ästhetische Idol* (Bern, 1956) pp. 87-98.

<sup>6</sup> See Rilke, *Orpheus, Eurydike, Hermes and Sonnette an Orpheus*; Pierre Emmanuel, *Orphiques, Tombeau d'Orphée*; Edith Sitwell, *Eurydice*; H. D. *Eurydice*.

<sup>7</sup> *Oeuvres Complètes de Jean Cocteau* (Paris, 1951) vol. 5, p. 24.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 74.

<sup>10</sup> Jean Cocteau and Andre Fraigneau, *Cocteau on the Film* (London, 1954) p. 101. Cocteau's new film, *Le Testament d'Orphée*, yet to be seen in the United States, is a nostalgic review of Cocteau's past films. Some of the characters from *Orphée* reappear to bid farewell to their creator; this is to be Cocteau's last film.

<sup>11</sup> Entitled *Point of Departure in Canada and Great Britain and Legend of Lovers in the United States*.

<sup>12</sup> *Orfeu de Conceicao*. The new title may have been suggested by Jean-Paul Sartre's *Orphée Noir* (Paris, 1948), a collection of French negro poetry.

<sup>13</sup> Quoted in Georges Sadoul, "Notes on a New Generation," *Sight and Sound* 28 (1959) 112.

## we see by the papers

editor RICHARD M. FRAZER, JR.

### FOR TOURISTS IN ROME

*These two articles (contributed by Professor Graydon W. Regenos of Tulane University) tell tourists (1) something to see and (2) how not to be seen. New Orleans Times-Picayune, November 13 and 15.*

RETURNED the other day to the casual glance of Rome's tourists, and to the lingering gaze of students, was the Laocoon statuary group—one of the most interesting relics of the ancient world; and one which has more of the spirit of modernity about it than most of the remnants that have been spared us from antiquity.

Missing from its customary exhibition spot for over two years, Laocoon, it turns out, has been divested of the handiwork of well-meaning restorers, including Michelangelo. Bereft of an arm raised in battle with a serpent, Laocoon's place in the category of sublimity—along with the Nike of Samothrace and the Venus of Milo—is reinforced. A well-wrought column, it has been said, is beautiful; that column, broken, takes on something of the sublime.

But Laocoon, which has long held the world's artists and philosophers in thrall, has much to tell the modern world. Its new incompleteness only underscores the message.

Overtly, here is a Trojan priest on whose head the goddess of wisdom visits vengeance. Presuming to warn fellow Trojans of the peril inherent in accepting Greek gifts (specifically a wooden horse), Laocoon is beset by sea serpents which the goddess sends to devour him and his sons lest he rouse the city. So much for myth. Struggling mightily in the fell clutch of circumstance, every line of the sculpture writhing and undulating like the rhythms of marbled music, Laocoon is so unlike the postured serenity that has entranced the world when contemplating most classical masterpieces that many have ventured to ask why this should be so. For here is a mirror of our own modern world, thrilled though tortured by the motion and the matter of progress—a world which realizes that it must continue to grapple with the puzzles which progress poses.

Some have said that in Laocoon Greek genius betrayed itself. Whether the law of measure—nothing too much—is violated in the elaboration of titanic struggle is a ques-

tion which has occupied scholars at some length. If our modern world has embraced the spirit of Laocoon, it has not been spared warning that the perpetual struggle must—if all is to remain well—be counterbalanced after a fashion by the spirit of contemplation. Power, no matter how massive, is never quite enough.

TOGAS are taboo on Via Veneto, where almost anything else goes.

Six toga-togged tourists—identified by police as five Americans and a Briton—discovered that. Police halted their toga parade on the famous Roman avenue, though they said their idea was "When in Rome, etc."

But that Rome, police told them, is long gone. Modern Italian law forbids wearing of togas or any other odd costume on the public streets unless a police permit is obtained in advance.

The group was herded into a police station Monday and warned not to do it again.

### MATTER OF FACT

*Our special thanks to Lt. Colonel S. G. Brady of Asheville, North Carolina, who has sent us classical items appearing in The Asheville Times during 1960. It would be impossible to print all of these items in We See, or even all of the best of them. But here are a few selections from the feature with the above title.*

WHY DID the Roman Empire hold together so long? The answer in part lies in the amazing discipline of her soldiers. The toughest veterans weren't excused from daily repetition of what they'd completely learned. In realistic war games, soldiers carried double-weighted arms, to make regular weapons seem light.

THE YOUNG ROMAN Caius Gracchus was a fine public speaker until he got excited. Then he'd lose control of his voice and temper, spoiling his whole speech. So he hired a servant to stand behind him with a pitch

pipe. Whenever Caius' voice broke with anger or got too loud, the servant would strike a soft note on his pipe. This finally taught Caius to simmer down and he became famous for his eloquence.

IN THE "good old days," about the most frightful weapon was a fierce animal. The Spanish conquistadors defeated the Indians with large dogs trained for fighting. According to the Roman poet Lucretius, the ancients used wild animals—lions, boars, and bulls as weapons.

IN ROMAN DAYS locksmiths made locks so small that the keys for them could be worn by the owners on rings attached to their fingers. Roman locksmiths were also the first to make metal locks.

MASS PRODUCTION isn't new. St. Augustine wrote about the silversmiths of his day: "... It is thought that most workmen are best employed by learning quickly and easily one portion of the whole work, and in this way it is not necessary to give all a thorough training in every branch. ..."

#### THE ISLES OF GREECE

The two articles below deal with the magic world of the Greek islands. The first (Time, December 19) takes us back to Homer. It is entitled, "Philoctetes Was Here." Question: And Chryses too?

SOME 3,100 years ago, the Aegean island of Chryse (pronounced Cry-see) soared rocket-like into brief prominence in the Mediterranean world. According to Homer's *Iliad*, what made the mighty Achilles sulk in his tent before Troy was the aftermath of a quarrel over the daughter of Chryses, high priest of the tiny island's temple of Apollo. Another famed Greek warrior, the archer Philoctetes, never got beyond Chryse; stopping off there on his way to Troy, Philoctetes was fatally bitten by a viper loosed on him, according to legend, by a local nymph whose advances he had spurned. But after that, mythology's Baedeker records little of Chryse, and some time about 240 B.C. the island mysteriously disappeared—sunk under the Aegean, so historians conjectured, by one of the earthquakes common in the area.

Last summer, intrigued by the legend of Chryse, a skin-diving Italian nobleman, the Marquis Piero Nicola Gargallo, set out to find the vanished island. A serious amateur archaeologist, Gargallo, 32, centered his search in the area favored by traditional

archaeological opinion—near the Dardanelles, on the ancient Greek invasion route to Troy. For tips on the island's precise location, he reread the pertinent passages in Homer and other ancients. Then, studying a detailed British Navy map, he came upon a sunken land mass known as Kharos Bank, a 10-sq. mi. area near the island of Lemnos, mentioned by Homer in connection with Chryse.

Guessing that Kharos Bank was a submerged piece of high ground, Gargallo sought confirmation from local sponge divers, fishermen and sailors—all of whom casually replied that, oh, yes, there were building blocks visible on the sea bottom at Kharos Bank. Diving alone with an Aqua-Lung in the face of strong currents, Gargallo maneuvered his way along the floor of the bank, which he found strewn with bits of pottery. After ten days' search, at a depth of 40 ft., he came upon scores of rectangular white stone blocks, which he believes to be the remains of Chryses' temple of Apollo.

Last week, from his Roman apartment, tall, balding Piero Gargallo was laying plans for another full-scale expedition to Chryse and its surroundings. Says he excitedly: "The entire Aegean and Mediterranean are one vast undersea museum. Anything you want—columns, amphorae, ceramics—it's all there for the taking."

The second article is a book review by Freya Stark (The New York Times Book Review, November 6). The book is Prospero's Cell and Reflections on a Marine Venus by Lawrence Durrell.

WITH LATER and better-known works to his credit, "Prospero's Cell," originally published in 1945, is still, I believe, one of Lawrence Durrell's best books—is indeed, in its gem-like miniature quality, among the best books ever written. I keep it handy for times when I seem to be forgetting the geniality of life. I can then open it at random and find "not so much a landscape as a climate, the waterless islands, the grey windmills, the olive trees and statues," and not their outwardness only, but their "patience and bitter harmony of experience and slow flux of Grecian days."

There is evoked what is rarely transmitted in any generation and almost never in our own—an atmosphere of happiness as radiant and all-embracing as the Ionian air. It is not described, but grows inevitable out of the "little eternities" of the island life and the untroubled charm of characters detached from any fictional demand for drama. Corfu is the island. An unclouded summer season was spent there before World War II, and

the episode is lifted by the brilliant craftsmanship into the realm of art.

Durrell writes, "I am aware of a hundred images at once and a hundred ways of dealing with them. The bowl of wild roses. . . . Greek cigarettes. The battered and sea-stained notebook in which I rough out my poems. The rope and oar lying under the tree. The spilt of the olive-press which will be gathered for fuel. The pile of rough stone for the building of a garden wall. A bucket and an axe. The peasant crossing the orchard in her white headdress."

"Reflections on a Marine Venus," published now in the same volume, was written later (1953). It deals with the island of Rhodes and does not hold quite the same magic. The elements are all present, but—as sometimes happens to a mayonnaise—they have not quite coalesced, and the radiance that makes "Prospero's Cell" so rare is missing. The years of war had come between.

Yet the style is equally remarkable and constantly arresting. No writer of our time seems to me to bring so much meaning out of the naked word. All is there, enclosed in those clearcut adjectives—the "troubled" Ionian blue between ribs of limestone, the "quibbles" of the flute on the hillside, the Greece where past and present coalesce.

"You will see him today"—the Rhodian seafarer—"if you have eyes, sitting in the crooked taverns of the old town rolling dice and hissing through his curling mustaches; or slapping down lucky courtcards and grumbling, while his free hand gropes absently for the bottle of mastic. And when the sponge fleet puts out you will see him, a small jaunty figure, sitting loosely over his tiller, as perfectly in time with the bucking sea as an expert rider with his horse, steering for the coasts of Africa."

In every age, they say, when the classics that have made us are in danger of being forgotten, a new interpreter comes forward to spread them freshly among us. We are lucky at this moment in two writers of beautiful English—Leigh Fermor and Durrell—who have made Greece their parish and are at home in its history, its meaning, and its life.

"The Greece I love," says Durrell—"poverty that brings joy without humiliation, the chastity and fine manners of the islanders, the schisms and treacheries of the townsmen . . . the taverns with their laurel wreaths, the lambs turning on the spit at

Easter, the bearded heroes, the shattered marble statues."

And he gives the meaning too:

"When you see the gravestones from the little necropolis of Cameirus, . . . it is the so-often repeated single word—the anonymous *Chaire*—which attracts you . . . It is not the names of the rich or the worthy . . . but this single word, 'Be Happy,' serving both as a farewell and admonition, that goes to your heart with the whole impact of the Greek style of mind, the Greek orientation to life and death: so that you are shamed into . . . realizing how little you have fulfilled . . . a thought so simple yet so pregnant, and how even your native vocabulary lacks a word whose brevity and grace could paint upon the darkness of death the fading colors of such gaiety, love and truth as *Chaire* does upon these modest gravestones."

#### ART AND ETYMOLOGY

The item below is from a review of *A Charm of Words* by Eric Partridge (The Times Literary Supplement, October 14).

IN ONE OF THE ESSAYS reprinted here Mr. Partridge says: "That etymology is a science, no one will deny; that it is also an art, far too many deny." In that sentence is the secret of the strength and value of his work. Always at the back of his most erudite tracking-down of the source, one is conscious of the man and the artist, warm, living, human and humorous.

One can disagree with Mr. Partridge over a trifle: that it was only by 1951 that *malarky* in the sense of "None of the old malarky" (a most interesting coinage from the modern Greek, *malakós*, soft, apparently) was introduced to these islands from America. The usage was current in south-east London as early as the 1930's.

To read his book is to be reminded of the magic that resides in words. To be able to demonstrate that *hoc anno novo* can, by a process of general corruption, turn into *hogmanay* is the work of no common mind; and the funny thing is that he is probably right. Odder, much odder, things happen constantly with words; and in this wordbook you can see them happening.

## PRODUCING GREEK TRAGEDY

O. G. BROCKETT

GREEK TRAGEDY has always been regarded as a standard of excellence for drama. Yet its production today is rare, as it has always been in the Christian era. Greek tragedy has been written about, read and urged as a model for imitation, but it has rarely succeeded in the theatre. The chief reason for this failure lies in the difficulty of visualizing the plays in production. When one ceases viewing Greek drama as literature to be read and tries to picture it in performance, abysses open up which seem almost unbridgeable. This is not to deny that classicists (and others) do consider the chorus, the physical theatre and such matters, but this historical consideration is quite different from the problem which faces a director as he attempts to envision the details of a play as it unfolds moment by moment on the stage. For example, our finest Greek scholars, because the available evidence is insufficient, cannot agree upon the nature of the scenic background used in the fifth-century theatre; a director, on the other hand, must create, frequently quite arbitrarily, a setting in all its particularity. Similar and innumerable problems no

doubt account for the fact that few persons have ever seen a really satisfying production of a Greek tragedy. As a result many have concluded that such a play is unproducible unless adapted for modern audiences. It is my purpose to take up some of the problems of presenting the unadapted Greek tragedy for modern audiences and to suggest solutions to these problems.

In general, difficulties in modern production may be grouped into three categories. First, and probably most important, there are problems of stylization which involve conventions no longer generally employed. Of these the chorus is the prime example. Secondly, the plays were written for a theatre in which the physical relationship of the audience to the performers is drastically different from that found in the modern picture-frame theatre. Third, the mythic, religious and sociological context of the plays is not sufficiently understood by modern audiences.

Approaches and solutions to these problems have been many, as may be seen from the Winter 1957 issue of



*World Theatre* which was devoted to a symposium on producing Greek tragedy. Problems and solutions are discussed there by such leading producers as Emile Hourmouzios and Alexis Minotis<sup>1</sup> of the Greek National Theatre, Tyrone Guthrie of the English and American theatre and Jean-Louis Barault of the French theatre.<sup>2</sup> Almost every article in this collection is an attempt to justify a particular approach through a *philosophy* of producing Greek drama. Answers are offered to such basic questions as: What does Greek tragedy have to offer contemporary audiences? What in these plays can still be made meaningful to them? Out of these questions grows another: How can the elements which are meaningful be best treated on the stage? Quite possibly these are the basic questions in producing any play from the past; certainly they have particular relevance to producing Greek tragedy, for out of the answers to these questions grow the solutions to every problem which arises.

The articles in *World Theatre* represent diametrically opposed opinions on the basic questions. The Greek producers Lino Carzis and Socrates Carantinos argue for as close an adherence as possible to fifth-century production methods. This approach, they believe, will make it possible for Greek tragedy to realize its full potential for lifting contemporary audiences out of their materialistic outlook into a more spiritual one. As Carantinos expresses it: "We must keep their high level and grandeur and instead of dragging the Ancients down to our own level, let us wake up and go out to meet them."<sup>3</sup> Carzis and Carantinos, therefore, advocate a production style which is highly formal and elevated.

On the other hand, Emile Hourmouzios and Alexis Minotis (currently di-

rectors of the Greek National Theatre) believe that the ritualistic and mythic aspects of Greek tragedy are lost to modern audiences and that productions should emphasize the human aspects of the plays. They argue that one must begin with modern stage conventions (which audiences understand) and adapt these, but that stylization must never be so great as to seem esoteric or to remove the plays from modern sensibilities. Consequently, they do not use masks in their productions, and they employ an acting technique which is modern though, as Minotis describes it, idealized.<sup>4</sup>

The former approach would seem to be rooted in a conception of Greek tragedy as treating "men as if they were gods," while the latter concentrates upon the conception of tragedy as treating "men like or somewhat better than ourselves." Critics of the second position argue that it reduces Greek tragedy to the level of modern social drama; while detractors from the first position argue that it removes Greek tragedy so far from human experience that it no longer communicates with the modern mind. There is, then, a fundamental difference of opinion about both *what* may be communicated to a modern audience and *how* it may be communicated.

The English director, Tyrone Guthrie, has taken up a position somewhere between the Greek factions. While emphasizing the formal and ritualistic elements in his production of *Oedipus Rex* he attempted to project the universal aspects through an emphasis on archetypal patterns. About the ritualistic element Guthrie has stated: "Our attempt was to raise the performance to a level of religious ritual, both movement and speech being as 'abstract' as we dared to make them."<sup>5</sup> The archetypal pattern was made evident



through the "scapegoat" theme in which Oedipus was interpreted as a Christ-like figure who atones for and cleanses the sins of his people. This interpretation was emphasized in the movement (arms held as though nailed to a cross, etc.), the music (Gregorian-like) and many details of the staging. In answer to a charge of pretentiousness, Guthrie replied:

Looking back, I now wish that I had had the courage to be even more pretentious, more stylized and more extreme. These dramas are, in my opinion, only reduced by concessions to the prevalent naturalistic mode in the theatre; the emotion of the audience is diminished from tragedy to pathos.<sup>6</sup>

The effectiveness of the productions by both Guthrie and the Greek National Theatre indicates that either of these approaches can lead to exciting and satisfying results. The important point, however, is that both started with a definite philosophy which they consistently applied. Too many directors do not have a strong basic attitude, and as a result in their productions the episodes are treated in one manner, the choral passages in another, and the parts are never properly integrated. Artistic "wholeness," on the other hand, results in part from decisions about the essential nature of the art product.

When we turn to a consideration of the specific means to be used we are automatically led to a consideration of conventions of the Greek theatre. There is the question, for example, as to whether masks will be used and if so how they shall be treated. A production which is to be highly formalized probably will make use of masks. Guthrie employed masks which greatly enlarged the features, whereas Jean-Louis Barrault in a production of the *Oresteia* in Paris used half masks which did not enlarge the face.<sup>7</sup> The

Greek National Theatre prefers not to use masks at all, arguing that this device is not an essential part of the Greek tragic form, and that more is to be gained from natural human features. Each of these decisions is the result of a larger philosophy and serves to emphasize that a director should be clear as to what he hopes to accomplish through the presence or absence of masks.

The use or refusal to use masks, however, is a relatively minor decision since nothing in the plays requires them today. The chorus, on the contrary, is an essential part of the dramatic form and must be dealt with in any production. And it is usually in the handling of the chorus that productions succeed or fail. Many productions are interesting and satisfying in spite of the chorus (Guthrie's *Oedipus* belongs here), but those productions in which the chorus is a truly integral part of the experience are rare.

Approaches to the staging of the chorus in the United States have generally been three: (1) the reduction of the chorus in number and the treatment of the members as individual characters who in turn speak parts of the choral passages without musical accompaniment or dance; (2) the retention of the classical chorus in number but treating it as one might a crowd in a modern realistic drama, without music or dance and with little unison speaking; (3) the retention of the classical chorus in number but treating it primarily as a group of dancers. In each case the director has admitted inadequacy before he begins and would, no doubt, prefer to dispense with the chorus. Under these circumstances the director expends his major effort on the episodes hoping that these will make up for the failure of the chorus. In spite of these typical ap-

proaches, the chorus can be dealt with satisfactorily if the director is willing to take the necessary steps.

If the production of a Greek tragedy is to be satisfying, the director must begin with a conception of the chorus as a unifying factor rather than as a disruptive feature; as something which joins and welds together episodes rather than as interludes between episodes. One must also conceive of the chorus as a unit. It is not merely a collection of speaking actors, nor a group of dancers, nor a singing group; it is all of these things, and the director should beware of thinking of it in only one of these aspects.

The chorus serves to fuse a number of elements: music, dance, speech. Since the Greek playwright considered music as one of his means of expression, it should accompany all choral passages. Music may be acquired either by adapting already existing music or by having it specially composed. Barrault, for his production of the *Oresteia*, had music adapted from a number of sources. He conceived of the trilogy as representing a shift from an Oriental to an Occidental outlook. Consequently, in the early parts Japanese and Indian themes were used, while in the later parts adaptations of the Gregorian chant and Bach were used.<sup>8</sup>

Music may be looked upon merely as a pleasurable accessory, but it can and should be much more. It may, for example, become a source of discipline. The difficulty of achieving unison from unaccompanied voices is readily overcome when music is used to establish the time factor. The Greek National Theatre offers a helpful example here.<sup>9</sup> Its music is specially composed for each play (with frequent consultations between composer and director) and orchestrated for wood-wind and percussion instruments. Typically the melodic

line is based on inflections of the speaking voice for passages which are to be sung. The background music helps to keep the chorus together, underscore points and build climaxes. As a result, there is a sense of control, of intensity, of progression; each choral passage becomes a structure with a beginning, middle and end. Furthermore, the mood and tone are controlled to lead from one episode to another without slighting the value of the choral passage itself.

The chorus is first and foremost a unit. It is possible to break up passages and movement and to give individual members solo parts (this has been especially popular since Robinson Jeffers' adaptation of *Medea*), but this fragmentation is usually another outgrowth of the director's lack of confidence in his ability to make effective use of the group. Variety is no doubt desirable, but it may be achieved sufficiently through shifts from group speaking, to chanting, to singing and only where necessary to solo speaking.

If choral passages demand both singing (or speaking) and dancing, which of these should be emphasized? The stage directors of the Greek National Theatre subordinate movement to intelligibility of language. Arnott argues that Greek playwrights never expected that all the words would be understood and that the emotional effect to be gained from music and dance is more important than intelligibility of language.<sup>10</sup> The problem, however, differs from play to play and from playwright to playwright. A production of the *Agamemnon* in which most of the choral passages were unintelligible would be mystifying and intolerable. On the other hand, many of Euripides' plays would make sufficient sense without the words of the choral passages. Euripides, if we can believe Aristophanes, put con-

siderable emphasis upon novelty in musical modes and this may become a source of pleasure in itself, but in a philosophical play such as the *Oresteia* musical beauty will not make up for the failure to understand the choral passages.

The context, therefore, must determine what should be emphasized in a choral passage, and this decision will in turn have important influence upon the treatment of movement, speaking and dance. Intricate dance patterns are not conducive to the projection of verbal meaning since movement will usurp the audience's attention. But a choral passage without movement should also be avoided. Movement may be simultaneous with the spoken or sung word, it may come between stanzas, it may precede or follow spoken parts. Endless variation is possible, and the director must rely upon his judgment in deciding which patterns will be most effective.

Movement is a source of pleasure and should be exploited. It should grow out of the play, however, rather than being superimposed upon it, if it is not to violate the essential characterization of the chorus and the context of meaning. For example, the dignified elders of the *Agamemnon* should have movement appropriate to their age and to the particular meanings they express. In addition appropriateness is also determined in part by the degree of stylization governing the production as a whole. In a relatively realistic production, movement is bound more rigidly by ideas of what men like these would be likely to do than in a highly stylized production. A sense of decorum must always be maintained unless there is to be a rude break between episode and choral passage. If the director has chosen an approach which is relatively realistic he would do well to forget the

word "dance" and to think in terms of "patterns of movement." The old men of the *Agamemnon* may move about in such a way that pleasing formalized patterns result, but it is the patterns rather than dance steps which will provide visual interest. On the other hand, if one envisions this chorus as considerably removed from everyday reality, the range of appropriate movement is enlarged.

It is difficult to treat the chorus as a conglomerate of actors at some times and as a conglomerate of dancers at another without shattering probability. The chorus must be actors and dancers simultaneously and from the beginning of the play, both in episodes and in choral passages, if unity is to be maintained. In too many productions the stately and dignified elders of the episodes become nimble-footed, posturing dancers when the choral passages are performed. The possibility of dance must be seen in the movement of the episodes, just as the dances of the choral passages must be carefully related to the characteristics and functions of the chorus members as actors in the drama.

Before considering the execution of these ideas further, some attention must be given to the physical arrangement of the theatre. There is a close relationship between the form of Greek tragedy and the physical theatre for which it was written. This does not mean that Greek drama cannot be staged in other types of theatres, but undoubtedly it cannot be done without difficulty and without careful planning. Shakespearean drama is not nearly so affected by the modern theatre structure as is Greek tragedy, for the chorus cannot be adequately staged without a large area between the actors and the audience. An area surrounded on three sides by the audience is best, prefer-

ably one which permits the audience to look down on the performance area so that the chorus will not obstruct the audience's view of the actors. It is difficult to work out a satisfactory arrangement in a proscenium theatre, but there has been increasing experimentation with new arrangements, such as theatre-in-the-round and proscenium-less stages. Unfortunately most of the arena stages now in use have acting areas too small to accommodate the classical chorus adequately. In the proscenium theatre, orchestra pits may be covered over to gain additional space. Barrault, for his production of the *Oresteia*, extended a circle into the auditorium and then placed a raised platform on the stage proper for the actors. Many other solutions are possible.

The movement of the chorus will depend on the available space and its shape. Ideally the chorus should be able to move an equal distance in all directions. It is also desirable that the chorus not have to be moved upstage and to the sides at the end of each choral passage to clear sight lines for the episodes, a frequent necessity in the proscenium-theatre arrangement. Interesting movement can be worked out, however, for almost any area regardless of its shape. The Greek National Theatre adjusts its choral movements from the full-circle orchestra at Epidaurus to the half-circle orchestra at the theatre of Herodes Atticus in Athens, and occasionally (and on tour) to the proscenium stage. That choral movement can be made effective in the proscenium theatre is amply illustrated by the performances of the Greek National Theatre company in New York in 1952, for which the critics had unqualified praise. It is especially interesting to note that what impressed the critics most was the treatment of the

chorus. The fact that the director must work in a proscenium theatre, therefore, is not sufficient reason in itself for abandoning or severely curtailing the chorus.

In planning the production of a Greek tragedy, more time should be allowed than the typical four- to six-week rehearsal period of the contemporary theatre. Finding the right music, working out the movement, training the chorus—all of these are time-consuming. Our experience with staging Greek tragedy, as compared with modern realistic drama or even other types of period plays, is limited, and for this reason time should be allowed for experimentation. Different kinds of plays demand different rehearsal techniques, and the approach which is effective with modern plays will not necessarily be so with a Greek play. The Greek National Theatre rehearses its chorus from six to nine months using music and dance from the beginning. While this amount of time is not available to most directors, the success of this group is indicative of the need for long and careful rehearsals.

Finally, Greek tragedy is approached with too much timidity. While these plays are "classics," and while more scholarship has been expended on them than any others excepting those by Shakespeare, we must work with modern theatrical resources and not those of fifth-century Athens. The plays must be made interesting and exciting to contemporary audiences, and the means for achieving this are not necessarily those which were effective with the original productions. And while we should be willing to learn from the theatre historian, ultimately we must remember that what is known with certainty about the theatre of the fifth century will not fill a half-dozen pages. Any talk of authenticity under

such circumstances is largely meaningless. Above all, we should remember that boredom in the theatre is a greater sin than lack of authenticity.

The emphasis here has been perhaps too much on the difficulties of producing Greek tragedy, but it is the failure to face up to these difficulties which has made the production of Greek tragedy of doubtful value to many. With the proper effort we can achieve amazing results, and out of this success can grow the necessary experience and confidence to increase the number of presentations of Greek tragedy. Greek drama when adequately produced has a power which can be imagined only imperfectly from the printed page; it becomes a true "living tradition"

rather than merely the remains of a great past.

*State University of Iowa*

<sup>1</sup> "The Production of Greek Tragedy: The Greek Point of View," *World Theatre* 6 (1957) 237-74.

<sup>2</sup> "The Production of Greek Tragedy: The Foreign Producer's Point of View," *ibid.* 274-84.

<sup>3</sup> "The Greek Point of View," p. 268.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 272.

<sup>5</sup> "The Foreign Producer's Point of View," p. 278.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 279.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 276-77.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 276.

<sup>9</sup> For a description of the working methods of the Greek National Theatre, see O. G. Brockett, "The Greek National Theatre's Staging of Ancient Drama," *Educational Theatre Journal* 9 (1957) 290-95.

<sup>10</sup> Peter Arnott, "The Lost Dimension of Greek Tragedy," *ETJ* 11 (1959) 99-102.

# BOOK REVIEWS

editor FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

**Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion**, by MOSES HADAS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Pp. vi, 324. \$6.00.

THE INTERACTION of Greek, Roman and Oriental ideas in the Hellenistic Age makes that period one of the most vital for the understanding of our civilization. Professor Hadas, while not attempting a systematic survey of intellectual crosscurrents of that age, cites numerous illustrations from the realms of language, literature, religion and law. Though there is comparatively little that is original, there is much stimulating and even exciting writing. The book is particularly interesting for its extended discussions of the interaction of Judaism and Hellenism.

Though his treatment is full of excellent insights, there are a number of questionable statements in Hadas' comparisons of the Greek and Hebrew languages and literatures. Love of bold imagery is presented (p. 52) as a characteristic of Semitic writing; but how about Aeschylus? In Biblical stories, we are told (p. 53), there is no background, no description of the personages engaged; but how about the *Book of Ruth*? Hadas contrasts (p. 53) the co-ordinate syntax of the Bible with "the elaborate subordinating syntax" of Greek; but the early Greek mind, as exemplified most notably in Homer, was primarily paratactic, as Ben E. Perry and Notopoulos have pointed out. The Greek poets, we hear (p. 54), are not concerned with truth; yet Hesiod starts his *Works and Days* with a promise to tell the truth, in obvious opposition to the program of Homer. Avowed literary fiction, we read (p. 54), probably did not exist in Israel; yet most scholars agree that much of the rich legendary material in the *Midrashim* is of considerable antiquity. "The Greeks seem almost to have lacked a sense of history: everything, whenever it happened, is conceived of as present" (p. 55); but the existence of various universal histories, notably those of Ephorus and Timaeus, contradicts this statement. In contrasting the Greek and Hebrew views of time, Hadas remarks (p. 56) that a Greek tragedy is timeless and that we are not invited to speculate

about what will happen in the future; yet we are told what will happen to such a character as Medea. We read (p. 56) that the treatment of sin as treason to a world order is alien to the Greeks; yet we read in Herodotus (6. 139) that the sinful deeds of the Lemnians brought failure of crops and decline of the birthrate, and we realize in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* (22 ff.) that the unconscious incest of Oedipus has poisoned Nature so that the Theban land is unproductive and its herds parched.

In pointing to parallels between Greek and Hebrew literature, Hadas has adopted a few rather extravagant suggestions of other scholars. Baer had pointed to a parallel in the order of the blessings in Aeschylus' *Suppliants* (630 ff.) and in the Hebrew prayer known as the Eighteen Benedictions. Hadas calls this similarity striking (p. 132); but a close comparison of the two sets of blessings shows that most of the blessings of the Hebrew prayer are missing in the *Suppliants*, while the others are generally so greatly modified that the similarity is surely not striking. Again, in subscribing to Kallen's suggestion that the author of the *Book of Job* was inspired by Euripides, Hadas stresses (pp. 136-37) that just as in Euripides the *deus ex machina* is intentionally employed to satisfy the more orthodox while nurturing the doubts of the non-believer, so in *Job* the spectator is left the freedom to accept or reject the response of God speaking out of the whirlwind. Hadas and MacLeish may not be satisfied with God's answer, but surely God's closing speech is too powerful and Job's answer too unequivocal to be regarded as leaving any doubt as to the conviction of the author of the book.

In his eagerness to see Greek connections with the Bible, Hadas asserts (p. 142) that *Ecclesiastes* is a close imitation of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. But surely there are closer affinities with the *Book of Proverbs* and occasionally with some of the prophets. Again, Hadas claims (p. 160) that it is clear from philological evidence that the *Song of Songs* belongs to the Hellenistic period. Yet, in his recent (1954) edition of this work, Gordis notes that there is all but universal rejection of a Greek date for



this book on the part of scholars today. Hadas' assertion, derived from Graetz, that the word *appiryon* (*Song of Songs* 3.9) is from *phoreion*, "litter, sedan-chair," is challenged by many scholars who prefer a derivation from *paryanka*, the Sanskrit word meaning "sedan," since it has become increasingly clear that Solomon had commercial relations with India. In addition, Hadas cites (p. 164) a striking parallel in structure between Theocritus and the *Song of Songs*, namely, the use of a refrain. But the refrain is found in 2 Samuel 1. 19, 25 and 27, which obviously is free from Hellenistic influence. Hadas also finds (p. 174) "a definitely Stoic coloring" in the absolute universalism of *Jonah*; but it is more likely that this universalism is in the tradition of *Isaiah* (42. 6 and 45. 22) and *Amos* (9. 7).

Often the parallels cited by Hadas between Greek and Hebrew literature are little more than the natural human response to similar situations. Thus Hadas compares (p. 162) the description of female charms in the *Palatine Anthology* (5. 47) and in the *Song of Songs* (4. 3-5). But it would be normal in describing one's beloved to mention her eyes, cheeks, neck, etc. Hadas is impressed by the fact that both descriptions start at the top and move downward; but is this not to be expected? And, above all, the actual descriptions, particularly the similes, are really surprisingly different.

Hadas also wishes (pp. 166-67) to connect the story of Darius' attack on Lindus in Rhodes with the *Book of Judith* in the Apocrypha. There are said to be three points of similarity: 1) both tell of attacks by powerful Oriental tyrants on a divinely favored community; 2) both mention the cutting off of the water supply by the attacker so that there was barely enough for five days; 3) both mention a miraculous intervention. The first and third points are commonplaces which one can find paralleled in Herodotus and in many other authors who give accounts of such attacks. And the nature of the miraculous intervention is very different in *Judith*, since it occurs through the bold scheme of Judith, from that in the chronicle of Lindus, where it occurs through the direct help of Athena who sends rain. The only parallel that is at all striking is the second; but it is a common device of besiegers to cut off the water supply of the beleaguered. The five-day interval, which may be nothing more than the period that human beings can last in the face of a water shortage, remains as the sole true parallel. It is

questionable whether one can connect the two stories on so thin a basis.

Again, Hadas claims (p. 167) the influence of Herodotus on the *Book of Judith*, since "the classic paradigm for the unexpected deliverance of a small and righteous people from the attack of an arrogant and overwhelmingly powerful invader is the story of the invasion and repulse of Xerxes as told in Herodotus and repeatedly echoed in later writers." But *Judith* had paradigms much closer to home, namely, the arrogant attacks of Amalek (*Exodus* 17. 8-16), Haman (in the *Book of Esther*), and Sisera (*Judges* 4. 1-5, 31), the last of which had a very similar heroine in Jael, who murdered Sisera. Hadas asserts (p. 168) that some of Herodotus' very phraseology is to be found in *Judith*, and he says that the clearest example is the phrase "earth and water" as a token of submission. But this phrase is Persian (Herodotus 6. 48) rather than Greek, and the author of *Judith* need not have read Herodotus to know it.

Hadas' discussion, in which he acknowledges his deep indebtedness to Martin Braun, of the influence of the Hippolytus-Phaedra story on the expansion of the Joseph story in Josephus and the *Testament of Joseph* in the Pseudepigrapha is indeed fascinating and undoubtedly has much truth; but he fails to consider the fact that some of these elements are also to be found in the Midrashic tradition. Hadas states (p. 155) that Joseph in the Bible, in rejecting the advances of the temptress, gives breach of trust and not necessarily carnality as his reason, whereas both Hippolytus in Euripides and Joseph in Josephus and in the *Testament of Joseph* do so out of loyalty to a religious principle. But Joseph in *Genesis* 39.9 does give as an additional reason for rejecting Potiphar's wife that it is a great wickedness and a sin against God; and it is this aspect, quite independent of Euripidean influence, that is emphasized in the Rabbinic tradition concerning Joseph.

Hadas asserts (p. 179) that there is a close kinship between the story of the Indian gymnosophist Calanus (found in a number of authors) and that of Eleazar in 4 *Maccabees*. Yet the only similarity is in the insistence on the part of both that no tyrant will compel them to act contrary to their own wishes, a notion frequently found in the accounts of the Biblical prophets. Hadas purports (p. 179) to find in the story of Calanus a parallel to Eleazar's view of the superiority of right reason to suffering, but this theme occurs in Philo's

comment (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 14) on the story, and not in the story itself.

Hadas is particularly subject to criticism when he alleges (p. 42) that Talmudic law represents a fusion of Graeco-Roman and native elements in both content and method. The para-governmental organization developed by the Talmudic Rabbis to govern every phase of the life of individuals is said by Hadas (p. 280) to be derived from Sparta; but the seeds of this close regulation are surely to be seen in the *Torah* itself. Salo Baron (*A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. 2 [Philadelphia, 1952] p. 415, n. 31) explains the similarities in content between Roman and Talmudic law as due to essentially parallel social backgrounds. Louis Ginzberg suggested that the similarities in legal formulae may be due to a common origin in the cuneiform law of ancient Mesopotamia. Hadas argues (p. 42), though without examples, that the Talmudic methods of reasoning are frequently adaptations of Hellenistic methods; but when we examine one such principle, the *qal wa-homer* (*a fortiori*), we find something very similar in the Indian *kimpunar*, and it seems unlikely that there was Hellenistic influence here (so L. Jacobs, "The Aristotelian *Qal Wa-Homer*," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 [1953] 154-57). The leading student of the comparative study of Talmudic and Roman law, Boaz Cohen, has often expressed his view that it is premature to draw any conclusions of influence; and the truth is that the differences, particularly in procedural law, are far more basic than the similarities. And, in any case, if Hadas is seeking parallels between Talmudic and Roman law, he has omitted one of the most striking, namely, the preservation of minority opinions.

One is bothered by a number of minor errors of commission or omission. Within two pages (48-49) I note the following: Mendelssohn translated the Bible into German in 1783 (not in the nineteenth century); Hadas says that the reader who does not know Greek and knows only Biblical Hebrew finds many passages in Rabbinic literature unintelligible, but a greater handicap than the lack of knowledge of Greek is a lack of knowledge of Aramaic, since so much of Rabbinic literature is written in it; in illustrating his contention that the general population of Palestine was familiar with Greek, Hadas contradicts himself when he remarks that Procopius had to employ a translator for the benefit of the Aramaic-speaking congregation. This would seem to indicate that the Jews did not

know Greek; moreover, Eusebius, whom Hadas cites, says that Procopius himself translated from Greek into Aramaic.

Though one can cite a number of other inaccuracies or highly questionable statements in the book, this reviewer intends to use it as his basic text in a course which he will be teaching in Hellenistic Civilization. To be sure, Tarn's well-known text is more careful and more comprehensive; yet it hardly conveys the electric feeling which one gets in tracing the Odyssey of ideas. Whether it is in perceiving the influence of Roman motifs in Chinese art, the influence of Semitic verse forms on the development of Menippean satire, or the parallels between Aeneas and Moses, this work is likely to challenge the reader. Professor Hadas has performed a notable service in thus dramatizing the movement of ideas in the Hellenistic Age.

LOUIS H. FELDMAN

Yeshiva University

**Il teatro di Sabratha e l'architettura teatrale africana**, by GIACOMO CAPUTO. Monografie di archeologia libica, VI. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1959.

THE NOTION that Graeco-Roman theater studies have entered a phase of continued vogue is periodically strengthened by the appearance or announcement of a new publication. The present volume, the sixth in a series devoted to the ancient monuments of Libya (one important monograph, the study of the theater of Leptis Magna by the same Caputo is yet to be published), handsomely presents and reviews the archaeological background of the theater of Sabratha. The author is already responsible for the earlier *Studio del grande bassorilievo con la danza delle Menadi in Tolemaide di Cirenaica*, published within the same series in 1948.

The first part of the present study, following a resumé of the excavations of the theater (begun in 1927 by Renato Bartoccini and completed with the appropriate restorations by Giacomo Guidi between 1928 and 1932, and the author in 1936-37) centers on a minute, structural analysis of the monument, its situation and chief characteristics. The sculptural decoration of the *pulpitum* are iconographically discussed and described. It is interesting to note that these reliefs offer an historical and social panorama of the function of the theater, depicting not only the spectacles

performed on the premises but also sacrificial scenes surrounding the allegorical figures of Rome, Sabratha and the Genius of the colony (identified as such by Caputo). These last details impel Caputo to connect these decorations with the passage of Septimius Severus through Tripolitania in 204. Following an examination of the hypocaustum, the scaena, the triportico behind the scaena, general remarks and conclusions are expounded on the construction date of the building: the end of the second century suggested by Guidi and confirmed by the later investigations of the British School in Rome is also approved by Caputo. The restoration scheme adopted for the theater and reviewed by the author, however methodically accomplished, naturally will raise the whole issue of restoration in the minds of some readers. The question is, however, too complex and involved to be discussed at length here with all its pros and cons. A brief appendix, dealing with a few wall-paintings and painted graffiti fragments conclude the first section.

In the light of some of the characteristics of the Sabratha theater, the second portion of the study widens the scope and engages in a thorough investigation of the theatrical architecture of North Africa. The Roman theaters of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Tripolitania are technically and morphologically re-examined and compared. The majority of these buildings date from Antonine times, although progressive embellishments in later years are to be taken into account. Sabratha reveals more coherent relationship with the North African group than the Cyrenaican, whose theaters maintain more specific Greek influences in harmony with the political and religious past of Cyrenaica. In the eyes of the author, the theater is a complex question which requires not only architectural, monumental and philological investigations, but also a "dynamic" study: in other words, the social and civilizing factors involved in the development of the theater cannot be overlooked.

The value of Caputo's work to Libyan archaeological studies hardly needs elaboration: his command of his material (down to recent bibliographical additions like the works of Frézouls and Grenier) and, even more, his close associations with the area and its excavations result in excellent presentation and discussion. Objections are very minor and would tend to be guided by one's personal interests. In the eyes of this reviewer, the tendency to dissect the Roman theater into "limbs," justifiable as it

is in view of the wealth of the material on hand, may soon produce unfortunate confusion and dissemination, which are further plagued by the uncertainties concerning the exact nature of imperial theatrical performances. The section dealing with the reliefs of the *pulpitum* could sustain a little more iconographical and stylistic analysis, especially the scene involving what Caputo labels *accademia teatrale*, with the extremely interesting seated, bearded figure. Confrontations with the Lep-tis Magna sculptures and their suggested Syrio-Anatolian inspirations would have been also most welcome.

The photographs and plans are up to excellent Italian standards. One point and two errata must be brought to attention: it would be helpful for the reader to have the photographs on the plates briefly identified, instead of merely numbered, listed in a master-list or referred to in the text. The two errata: on p. 28, col. 1 of the section "*Il triportico . . .*", line 3 probably refers to *tav.* and not *fig.* 62; and on pp. 63, col. 2, line 1, and 81, footnote 149, *Verulamium* is to be substituted for *Verulamium*.

KENAN ERIM

New York University

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON SUMMER QUARTER JUNE 19 - AUGUST 18

### Classics Program

FACULTY: Visiting Professor Waldo E. Sweet, Resident Professors Rosenmeyer, Read, Grummel, Pascal, and Wyatt.

TEACHERS' COURSES: Techniques and Materials, Prof. Sweet; Caesar for H. S. Teachers.

LATIN: Intensive elementary course, Prof. Sweet; intensive second-year reading and grammar; advanced course in Cicero's Orations; supervised study courses.

GREEK: Intensive elementary course; supervised study courses.

CLASSICS IN ENGLISH: Roman Archaeology; Greek and Roman Drama; Mythology.

Write for Bulletin and information to:

Professor J. B. McDiarmid  
Department of Classics  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5, Washington

**Virgil's Aeneid**, translated and annotated by MICHAEL OAKLEY, with an introduction by E. M. Forster. Everyman's Library, No. 161. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. Inc., 1957. Pp. xvii, 298.

IN A "Translator's Note," which follows E. M. Forster's Introduction, Mr. Oakley sets up as his goals what he calls the essentials of a good translation. First on the list is "fidelity to the original." This he achieves to about as great a degree as would be possible in a metrical version.

Another goal is the selection of a verse form which will reproduce the "splendour and beauty of the *Aeneid* as Vergil wrote it." As his poetic vehicle Mr. Oakley has chosen "a line of five stresses separated by one or two unaccented syllables, the general rhythm being, like that of the Latin hexameter, dactylic." He feels that the great flexibility of this meter enables him to adhere very closely to the original. In this reviewer's opinion, however, he has not been consistently successful in reflecting the sound and feeling of Vergil's lines. There are passages (such as the opening of Book 1) which one may read aloud and be strongly reminded of Vergil's rhythm, but there are many verses which do not quite live up to Mr. Oakley's promise in his preface that any line will "read itself" if the ordinary rules of good reading are observed." Dido's speech as she sees Aeneas' ships leaving her shores (pp. 83-84) falls a little flat because the lines are at times jerky and the impression is one of artificial rather than genuine emotion. On the other hand, her earlier speech reproaching Aeneas to his face for his decision to leave (pp. 76-77) does have much of the power of Vergil's lines.

Other qualities which Mr. Oakley hopes to attain are a "straight-forward order of words" which will allow the reader to follow the story without getting involved in syntax, and a style of language which will avoid both "the flatness of an uninspired literalism and the unwarranted exuberance of the 'poeticized' style" affected by some translators. Yet much of the flatness which permeates many passages of this translation results from the language rather than from the metrical arrangement. It is true that the meaning is usually clear, but sometimes a too literal rendering of Vergil's language causes unnecessary wordiness. Roman writers frequently piled up synonyms, and Vergil's magnificent command of poetic language enables him to do it effectively. One cannot say as much for Mr. Oakley's often rather pedestrian rendering.

Perhaps the lack of vividness which charac-

terizes many sections of the book may result in part from Mr. Oakley's very attempt to avoid "unwarranted exuberance." Consider, for example, the famous description of Rumor (p. 71). There the translator says of Rumor "upward she grows," she "is sitting on guard on the top of a roof," she "fills great cities with fear," she is "now supplying the nations with many a tale, And joyed in the doing of it, reporting alike That which had truly been done, and that which had not." He calls Rumor a "huge and horrible monster," describes Dido as "beauteous" (a word of which, regrettably, he seems quite fond since he uses it rather freely [see, e.g., pp. 168, 250, 286]) and speaks of the "wanton extravagance" of Aeneas and Dido. This is all perfectly clear English and some of it is a literal translation of the Latin words, but too many of these expressions lack vividness because of their generality, their triteness, or their wordiness. Also such unnatural word order as "droops not her eyes" and "Dido scorned not" may work out better for the meter, but it adds to the impression of stilted English.

Further increasing the stiffness of many lines is an unfortunate device deliberately adopted by the translator (see p. xiv), who states that "no attempt has been made to dress up the text in the outmoded finery of an older poetic convention" except for adherence to the old forms of the second person singular and the occasional use, in imitation of Vergil, of an archaic term. The archaisms are, however, more than occasional, and they, together with the stilted phrasing which appears so often, do give the impression of the "outmoded finery" which the translator promises to avoid. The older pronouns—"thou," "thee" and "thy," with such accompanying verbs as "art," "shalt," "wilt," "mayest," "hast," "boughtest" and "thinkest"—produce no such effect as Vergil gains with his archaic Latin words. The archaic pronouns in English were over-used by older translators who seemed to feel that the only way to reproduce the atmosphere of an ancient work was through archaic English. As a result, these pronouns generally strike today's reader as stilted and artificial, as, also, do such expressions as "make haste" and "woe," both used repeatedly. "When lo!" (p. 41) and "O cruel one" (p. 75), a phrase too mannered to have much impact. Still other examples of expressions contributing to an artificial tone are "forsooth," "alas," "affright," "betimes," "hark," "yonder," "boon," "graven," "riven asunder," and "be-took her" and "bid him" used reflexively. The translator is, apparently, hopelessly

## A SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS OF LATIN

June 26 - July 28

July 31 - September 1

The program will include  
A demonstration Latin 5 Advanced Placement course  
and these graduate courses:

Roman Comedy

Vergil

Latin Prose

Linguistics

Latin Lyric Poetry

History of the Roman  
Republic

### *Taught by:*

Allan Hoey, *Director*

The Hotchkiss School

Margaret Taylor

Wellesley College

James Notopoulos

Trinity College

Eugene Davis

Trinity College

H. Allen Gleason

Hartford Seminary  
Foundation

To receive a description and catalogue write

Director of the Summer School

Trinity College

Hartford 6, Connecticut



addicted to "hap," "haply" and "hapless," which recur so often that the reader begins somewhat shrinkingly to expect at least one example on each page. Such tortuous or wordy phrases as "bring succour in this my distress" (p. 201), "the selfsame he" (p. 203), "of himself let us crave" (p. 253) and "make prayer" (p. 168) do not help the readability of the book. In the midst of all these outmoded words and phrases it is almost humorous to come suddenly upon such a modern colloquialism as "hefty" (p. 261) or "chancy" (p. 271), and the use of "your" and "thee" in consecutive lines of a speech (p. 54) strikes one as an absurdity.

It seems, therefore, that Mr. Oakley has, in spite of himself, been captivated by the "older poetic convention," and it is a question whether a style so definitely tinged with an archaic flavor will draw many readers. Students have long been weary of the older conventional translations, and both they and the general public may very possibly reject a book so obviously reminiscent of those translations, especially since several recent ones have presented the adventures of Aeneas in more vivid and contemporary language.

If this should prove true, it would be unfortunate for two reasons: first, because numerous good, readable translations encourage the public to become acquainted with classical literature; and second, because there are many descriptive passages in Mr. Oakley's version which are quite pleasing, offering vivid pictures and evoking definite response from the reader. Among them are the account of the storm in Book 1 (pp. 3-5), the destruction of Troy as Venus shows it to her son in Book 2 (pp. 39-40), the description of night in Book 4 (p. 81), the picture of Charon (p. 121) and the view of the valley through which ran the river Lethe (p. 133) in Book 6 and the scene in Book 7 as Aeneas first looks upon the Tiber and the wood around it (pp. 140-41).

In the opinion of this reviewer the last six books of this translation are more consistently good than the first six. Some of the battle scenes have a power and urgency about them which keep the reader at constant attention, and there are other passages with real feeling. The bloody deeds and the deaths of Nisus and Euryalus (pp. 198-202) are vividly described though the speeches put in their mouths even in these tense moments are for the most part couched in stilted and archaic language; there are tenderness and pathos in the account of the preparations made for sending Pallas' body home to his father and in Aeneas' last farewell to the young warrior

(pp. 244-45); and the final scene (pp. 295-98) showing Juturna's anguish and the death of Turnus is handled with sufficient power to form a reasonably strong conclusion to the book.

HAZEL M. TOLIVER

Lindenwood College

**Laudes**, by JOSEF EBERLE. Tübingen: Rainer Wunderlich Verlag Hermann Leins, 1959. Pp. 79. DM 6.80.

AUCTOR HORUM CARMINUM neque magister linguae Latinae est nec praeceptor academicus. Acta diurna redigit Stutgardiae quae Germanice *Stuttgarter Zeitung* appellantur. Eximiam traditionem persequitur Germaniae Australis quae, ipsa terra Romana antiqua, semper culturae studioque litterarum humanarum dedita erat. Quamquam his temporibus studium linguarum antiquitatis et in Germania negligitur, tamen editio princeps huius libelli (mille quingentorum exemplarium) spatio semestri venit. Editio secunda iam evulgata est. Mira fortuna, at non tam inexplicabilis si legis haec poemata. Verus poeta cantat, non simius Horatii. Latinitas poetarum medii aevi utitur. "Haec (carmina) non more metrico, sed rhythmico composui, praeterea versus extremis syllabis consonandos feci. Qui Latinitatis aureae peritus est, etiam nonnulla verba inveniet, quae apud Vergilium, Horatium, Ovidium aliosque veteres frustra quaeret," in praefatione nos monet auctor. Cur non? Latinitas viva, praecipue Latinitas ad novas res dicendas apta, in carcere Latinitatis antiquae in aeternum teneri non potest.

Quid tum dicam de concinnitate et elegantia *Laudum*, de hilaritate leporeque earum? Maxime me delectaverunt duo carmina, Lutetiae atque Romae dedicata, sed difficile est inter tanta exquisita eligere quae sint optima. Multiforme genus rerum hominumque cantat poeta, semper adaptans prolationem, rhythmum, concisionem argumento carminis. Varietas versuum atque argumentorum oblectat; mirifica exstat habilitas loquendi; tametsi sensus nonnullorum carminum hilaris facetusque est, non absunt graviora. Philosophia auctoris nobiliter Epicurea est. Ridet poeta quia novit "conditionem humanam," extollit vitam, haud timet mortem amicam, solamen nobis affert, sapientia sua et arte nos iuvat et laetificat.

JOHANNES A. GAERTNER

Lafayette College



**Classical Studies for Alexander David Fraser**, edited by EDWARD C. ECHOLS. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: Weatherford Printing Co., n.d. Pp. x, 102. \$2.00. (Available from Edward Echols, 233 E. University Parkway, Baltimore 18, Md.)

THIS LITTLE VOLUME, intended as a *Festschrift* to be presented to Dr. Fraser at the conclusion of his service at the University of Virginia in June, 1956, became instead a memorial to him following his death in August, 1955. Its publication was arranged by a committee of four and 55 patrons whose names are listed on page ii. Appropriately the introductory section contains a portrait of Dr. Fraser, a brief biography and his bibliography.

The contributions made by friends and colleagues show a variety of interests in the realm of classical studies. Beginning with "A New Bust of Livia in the Robinson Collection" by the late David M. Robinson, there follow in order: "A Note on the *Dochmius*" by James S. Constantine; "Notes on the Text of Servius on *Aeneid* III," Arthur Frederick Stocker; "The Aeneas Legends and Vergil's Predecessors," Robert Epes Jones; "A Roman Tale of the Sea: *Aeneid* III," E. L. Highbarger; "The Island of Paros," Louis E. Lord; "A Previously Unpublished Letter of Nicolaus Heinsius," Marvin L. Colker; "Lead Us Not Into Temptation," S. Vernon McCasland; "Jefferson Majors in the Classics," Graves H. Thompson; "Saint George and the Dragon," Pauline Turnbull; "Purple: The Color of Power at Rome," Edward Echols; "The Cruelty of Constantius II," Elfrieda Frank; "The Birthday of Augustus," Arthur Kaplan.

All classicists will find the articles concerned with the *Aeneid* of value and those by Lord, Thompson, Echols and Kaplan of considerable interest.

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

Indiana University

**The Twelve Olympians**, by CHARLES SELTMAN. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960. Pp. 208. \$4.50. (First published in 1952 by Pan Books Ltd., London; revised in 1956)

DR. SELTMAN's canon of Olympians excludes Hestia, as having effaced herself in favor of Dionysos, and Hades, in whose place is found Demeter. (The others are, of course, Hera, Zeus, Athene, Hermes, Aphrodite, Hephaistos, Ares, Apollo, Artemis and Po-

## The Sixth New England LATIN WORKSHOP

Professor Van L. Johnson, Founder  
July 5-July 28

Tufts University 1961 Summer School  
in cooperation with the  
Classical Association of New England  
GUEST LECTURERS—EXHIBITS—  
MUSEUM TRIPS—RECREATIONAL  
FACILITIES—SUMMER THEATER

### Staff members include:

John K. Colby, Phillips Academy;  
Ralph Marcellino, West Hempstead  
High School; Arthur L. Spencer,  
Reading High School; Robert Wol-  
verton, Tufts.

### For complete information write:

Dr. Robert E. Wolverton  
TUFTS UNIVERSITY  
Medford, Massachusetts

Suburban Campus in Historic  
Metropolitan Boston

seidon.) His orientation is from archeology and religion rather than from literature. He presents archeological evidence in support of his views—or, rather, conclusions—concerning Greek religious beliefs.

While acknowledging substantial debts of information to Homeric epic, Pindar and Euripides, he is chiefly determined to present the Olympians with respect to ante-literalistic provenience and cultus. His most extensive literary quotations are, understandably, from the Homeric Hymns.

The first chapter lists "the beliefs of the Greeks" in inferential contrast to Christian beliefs: there was no class or caste of priests; humility and obedience were never Greek virtues; Greek religion had no dogma; there were no missions, no martyrs; there was no Sacred Book; there was very little preoccupation with sin. The twelve subsequent chapters, summarizing the respective religious environments of the Olympians, provide implicit and explicit comparisons of Greek with Christian religious attitudes; for example: Hera is "Our Lady"; "Zeus was, Zeus is, Zeus shall be"; "When the Virgin Mary replaced Athene she . . . became *Mater Theou Parthenos Athenaia Gorgo Epēkoos* . . .";

Hermes and the Virgin Mary share a patronage of thieves; "the Paphian has been merged in the Virgin Mary . . . under the title of *Panaghia Aphroditessa*"; Artemis appropriated much of the Virgin Mary's cult; "Herakles, a mortal like the two Hebrews, likewise went up to heaven in fire."

Herakles is one of the "honorary Olympians." The others are Asklepios, Alexander the Great and Augustus. Four *Theoi* or *Divi* are Pythagoras, Ptolemy Savior, Antiochus IV and Cleopatra. Julius Caesar "was counted a god by the Romans" but is here excluded from the chosen, along with Antinoos, Diocletian, Maximian and Constantine the Great.

This confusion of historical with mythical personages, as well as the admixture of archeological with anthropological data, is skillfully resolved by the subsumption of all topics under the study of Greek religion. But Dr. Seltman makes no attempt to elaborate upon the differences between religion, myth and legend, or for that matter between myth and mythology (e.g., "Mythology embraced Leto and her twin children Artemis and Apollo as a single holy family. . .").

His study is largely scientific. But much of his commentary is editorial. He disclaims that in his chapter on Greek beliefs there is any proclamation of his personal views, and notes that these are touched upon in his Epilogue.

Personal views, as such, however, are not reserved for the Epilogue. In Chapter III he states that "mysticism can easily become the religion not of hope, but of despair." Speaking in Chapter VI of the quest after both security and happiness, he says that "these states of mind cannot co-exist, save for a very brief period." Elsewhere there is a reminder of "the deadly tedium of security." In Chapter VII he insists that the Greeks were not "rationalists" and toys with the notion that Hephaistos is "the forerunner of the motor-car" and "was himself the actual divine gas, the essence, the petrol which activates the internal-combustion engine." Chapter VIII: "There is no deity in the whole august company of immortal gods, evolved and worshipped by anxious humanity, who is more deserving of our commiseration than is Ares." It seems questionable that Homer invites commiseration for the butcher Ares, who delights in war and slaughter for their own sake, when he contrasts this Satanic figure with Athene, who surely represents the nobility and dignity that can emerge from

## Western Maryland College SUMMER LATIN WORKSHOP

June 26 - July 14

With the cooperation of the CAAS

Language Laboratory  
Lectures, Exhibit, Trip

Offered Concurrently  
Classical Civilization and Ideas  
June 22 - July 26

For Complete Information Write  
For Brochure

Dr. William R. Ridington  
Western Maryland College  
Westminster, Maryland

the necessary evil of war; but Dr. Seltman cites the Ares of the *Odyssey* rather than the Ares of the *Iliad*. Chapter XI: "Of all the popular symbolic figures who have come down from ancient mythology to the present day, there is only one who is something of a figure of fun: Father Neptune with his company of fish-tailed mermaids." To clarify this puzzling statement, the commentator does no more than quote Rupert Brooke's *Heaven*, in which "there is a sense of magnificent incongruity in the juxtaposition of deity and fish." Well now, Zeus on the loose is something of a figure of fun in *Leda's Fortunate Gaffe* (Ogden Nash, 1952): Zeus Pater is contextually teamed with Walter Pater and *Swann's Way*. And as for the non-comic juxtaposition of deity and fish it is necessary merely to recall the fish as an early symbol of Christ.

There are as well a few rather strong personal views on literary figures. Hesiod is said to be in deplorably bad taste for using "rubbish"; he "was as unsuited to write a *Theogony* as Robert Burns would have been to write *Paradise Lost*." Lucian is identified as an "atheist cynic," Cassan-

der as an "arch-villain." On the other hand, "in all literature there are few poems to equal" the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*.

Personal views also result in some entertainingly provocative phrases: "Aunt Hestia"; "brilliant and popular politician of an ancient and horsey family"; "Apollo's Foreign Office"; "Poseidon the horse" (i.e., Poseidon Hippios).

The Epilogue combines numismatics with humanism. Dr. Seltman writes of the Olympians as represented on coins and then outlines a six-point lesson which "Greek paganism" can "teach us about the value of a group of principles that make for humanism." His convictions regarding the relevancy of Greek paganism (Greek religion?) to modern thought provide the text with its thesis—and its dedication ("To Pan and the Nymphs").

ROY ARTHUR SWANSON

University of Minnesota

**The Book of Daun Burnel the Ass**, by Nigellus Wireker. Translated by GRAYDON W. REGENOS. With eight illustrations by Luis Eades. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1959. Pp. ix, 166. \$4.50.

THE ROLLS SERIES is a collection of medieval British authors, mostly Latin authors. Volume 59, published in 1872, in two parts, is known also as *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets*; the first part of volume 59 contains the text of the *Speculum Stultorum* of Nigellus Wireker (ca. 1130—ca. 1200). The surname is suspect. To the name Nigellus a 13th century MS. adds the appellation *de longo campo*, and the assumed surname Longchamps is now gaining acceptance. The author was, in his own words, "least of the brothers of the church at Canterbury, a monk in dress, a sinner in life, a priest in rank."

The poem itself consists of more than 1900 elegiac couplets; it is divided by prose sentences that epitomize the story. The author's prose introduction gives a summary of the poem and the interpretation of the allegory.

Professor Regenos has subsumed Nigellus' introduction into a new English preface (pp. 4-20) and gives so excellent a summary of the narrative (pp. 9-15) that there is surprisingly little more in the long text itself. The elegiacs appear as English unrhymed couplets, e.g.,

I'm not the wise Brunellus, but a dolt,  
An Ass forever, prince of fools, a dunce.  
A fool I was when born, a fool before,  
And nothing but a fool shall always be.

## The Seventh Indiana LATIN WORKSHOP

June 17-July 7

*Choice of study groups concerning:*

HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN AUTHORS  
DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
ANCIENT CITY  
TEACHING OF LATIN IN RUSSIA  
CLASSICAL AND MODERN DRAMA

Staff: HUGH F. GRAHAM  
NORMAN T. PRATT, JR.  
EDWIN S. RAMAGE

*For complete information write:*

Professor Norman T. Pratt, Jr.  
Department of Classics  
Indiana University  
Bloomington

This rhythm, repeated with a minimum of trochaic inversion for 1900 couplets, will try the reader's patience, but perhaps not more so than the medieval Latin original. Nigellus himself characterizes his work as *stilus rudis*. At its best, the version is nimble; at its more mechanical moments, it reminds one of the beating of a metronome. But whatever the meter, it is an accurate version; for a sample, I compared pp. 116-17 of the translation with the original, and I found not one single word I could question, and not one passage where I can think of an improvement. Nothing was added to fill the meter, and nothing was left out.

Some fifty notes illustrate the resemblance of the text to a variety of ancient authors: Horace, Avienus, Maximianus, Ovid, the *Disticha Catonis*, Vergil, Persius, the *Anthologia Latina*, Lucan and Columbanus.

The narrative and the pleasing digressions from the narrative will carry the reader along. The hero is Burnellus the Ass, who brings all his troubles on himself through ill-advised ambitions to have a shorter tail, and then a longer one; to attend the University of Paris and to become a bishop; to found a new religious order and to visit Rome. These visionary plans miscarry in a

series of comical misadventures, vaguely like the incidents in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. The vague resemblance is somewhat enhanced by the insertion of three narratives told by Gallienus, Arnold and by Brunellus himself, and by the fourth narrative, Milesian in appearance and pedigree, loosely attached at the conclusion of the poem.

The divagations afford relief from the narrow scope of the poem which is, almost entirely, a survey of human weaknesses as seen in individual ambitions, in commerce, government, learning, the orders and the hierarchy. The satire, however, is not at the expense of any single person, nor even of the institutions named in this interesting poem. Thus Brunellus' detailed examination of the religious orders (pp. 103-15) is not actually at the expense of the Hospitalers, Black Monks, White Monks, Order of Grandmont, Carthusians, Black Canons, Moniales, Premonstratians, Secular Canons, Good Canons, or of the order of Simplingham, but of the ridiculous accommodations that we find ourselves making to our weaknesses, even in such austere surroundings.

The English appellation, "the book of Daun Burnell the Ass," is Chaucer's, but the reader will not find here the consummate finish, the wide range of humor, nor the precise descriptions of clothing, character, speech and customs that we know from Chaucer. Nigellus' range is narrower, and we must value the book because for the space of two hours we can see the world as Nigellus the monk saw it, a place where lack of contentment drives men to make fools of themselves.

The bookmaking is excellent: jacket, illustrations, index, type and paper are unexceptionable; and may attract other buyers than the *genus academicum*. It is not difficult to foresee that a second printing will be needed.

JAMES R. NAIDEN

Seattle University

**Antike Kunstwerke**, by ADOLF GREIFENHAGEN. Antikenabteilung, Ehemals Staatliche Museen Berlin. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1960. Pp. 46. 100 plates.

AT LONG LAST the ancient treasures of the Berlin museums are returning from their wartime exile. The collections have suffered. It is disheartening to note, for instance, that the Berlin Painter's best known work shows the marks of war, though in this case we may be thankful that the damage is minor. But it is regrettable as well

that a number of valuable pieces have disappeared since the war into the hands of common thieves.

Greifenhagen draws attention to the return of these art objects by presenting a number of them to the reading public. Here are shown sculptures, bronzes, Greek vases of all kinds, glass, gold and silver work, ivories and even a few mummy portraits. There is something to interest everyone, whether it is an archaic grave stele or a bronze griffin's head, a vase of the Amasis Painter or a Kertsch vase, a dagger sheath of gold from Scythia or a pair of delicately worked gold earrings from Greece. All of these are presented in excellent photographs.

The text of forty-six pages does not at all do justice to so many objects so wide-ranging both in space and time. It is for quick reading. Besides a thumbnail description of each object, there are interspersed explanations of a few myths as well as brief discussions of such questions as why we speak of an "Amasis Painter." For those who may have more than just a passing interest in the objects illustrated, Greifenhagen has added a bibliographical résumé. Here is most of the literature on each of the entries.

This, then, is primarily a picture book for the amateur who would rather look than read. It is a book that one could expect to find for sale at the front desk of a large museum, where its fine plates would catch the eye of the visitor who wished to carry away a reminder of what he had seen.

EDWIN S. RAMAGE

Indiana University

## BRIEF NOTICES

**The March Up Country: Xenophon's Anabasis**, translated by W. H. D. Rouse. A Mentor Classic, MD 278. New York: The New American Library, 1959. Pp. 192. \$50.

Now we have an American paperback reprint of this translation which is published in hard covers by Michigan (see CJ 53 [1958] 398).

**Josephus: The Jewish War**, translated by G. A. Williamson. The Penguin Classics L 90. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1959. Pp. 411; one stemma, 3 maps. \$1.25.

The translator contributes not only a good introduction (pp. 7-17), but also nine excursuses on various important topics (371-

401), an appendix on The Slavonic Additions (which Williamson, I believe wrongly, defends in toto; some of the passages sound like nine-dollar bills), a correlation of chapters with Whiston's version and a table of important dates.

**Apollonius of Rhodes: The Voyage of the Argo**, translated by E. V. Rieu. The Penguin Classics L 85. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1959. Pp. 207. \$ .95.

Another prose version in Rieu's familiar style. Rieu contributes also an Introduction (pp. 9-32), two brief textual notes (197) and a Glossary of names (199-207).

**An Anthology of Roman Drama**, edited by P. W. HARRIS. Rinehart Editions 101. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1960. Pp. xxxi, 317. \$1.25.

The translations included are *Menaechmi* by R. W. Hyde and E. C. Weist, *Rudens* by C. K. Chase, *Phormio* and *Adelphoe* by W. A. Oldfather, and Seneca's *Medea*, *Phaedra* and *Thyestes* by Ella Isabel Harris. Harsh contributes an Introduction (pp. xiii-xxviii) and minor editorial changes in the various translations. This should be a useful text, though the Seneca version is a wee mite archaic for most college freshmen.

**Plutarch, Eight Great Lives**, edited by C. A. ROBINSON, JR. Rinehart Editions 105. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1960. Pp. xviii, 364. \$1.25.

This reprint (of the Dryden translation revised by A. H. Clough) includes the lives of Pericles, Alcibiades, Coriolanus, Demosthenes, Cicero, Alexander, Caesar and Antony, plus two of the comparisons (Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Demosthenes and Cicero). The editor contributes a brief introduction, a map, a bibliographical note, a note on Greek and Roman money, and a stemma of the Julio-Claudian family.

**A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae**, edited by W. V. CLAUSEN. Oxford Classical Texts. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. Pp. 198; indices nominum, pp. 185-98.

This replacement for Owen looks like a very useful text, which differs from Owen's somewhat less than once per page, and often gives more information in the apparatus (but sometimes less). However, it is handsomely printed, has page numbers and adopts the sensible custom (recently spreading in Eng-

## University of the Pacific SUMMER LATIN PROGRAM June 19-July 21, 1961

\*Advanced Reading: Plautus 2 units

\*Latin Conversation 2 units

### Refresher Courses

Designed especially for teachers in other fields who anticipate teaching Latin

\*Review of Latin Fundamentals 4 units

\*Vergil: *Aeneid* 2 units

For complete brochure write:

Professor  
Robert J. Smutny  
University of the Pacific  
Stockton 4, California

land) of printing u everywhere instead of maintaining the misleading medieval distinction between v and u.

**Livy XIV**, translated by A. C. SCHLESINGER, index by Russel M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. 557; 2 maps, general index, pp. 321-557. \$3.00.

Here at last is the final volume of the Loeb Livy, including the text and Schlesinger's translation of the summaries, fragments and Julius Obsequens, and a copious general index by Geer, which will certainly be very useful.

**Aelian: On the Characteristics of Animals**, translated by A. F. SCHOLFIELD. Vol. II, Books 6-11. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. 413. \$3.00.

This is the second volume of three. These entertaining anecdotes will probably be of especial interest to students of the Middle Ages, some of whom nowadays (alas) are not fluent in Greek.

**Plutarch's Moralia**, translated by P. H. DeLacy and Benedict Einarson. Vol. VII (523C to 612B). Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. 618; index, pp. 607-18. \$3.00.

This volume (the 7th of 15; the 10th and 12th have also appeared) contains a number of famous works, including the *De Sera Numinis Vindicta*. The translation seems to be generally smooth and accurate, as we would expect.

**The Stoa of Attalos II in Athens.** Excavations of the Athenian Agora Book No. 2. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies, 1959. 36 photographs. \$.50.

Here is a pictorial description of the modern reconstruction of this simple but impressive ancient building in the Athenian Agora. The photographs show the Stoa at various stages in its construction, as well as the tools and building techniques employed by the restorers.

**Miniature Sculpture from the Athenian Agora.** Excavations of the Athenian Agora Book No. 3. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies, 1959. 79 photographs. \$.50.

Examples of the miniature sculpture from the Agora are here arranged in chronological

order. Such interesting examples as an ivory jewel box, a chariot with horse and driver, comic satyrs, Eros, Aphrodite, a horse on wheels and a hedge-hog are included in the panorama.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER will award a classical scholarship, covering full tuition for two years, to that member of next year's freshman class who intends to major in Latin or Greek and who is judged to possess the highest qualifications among those competing for this award. The scholarship holder whose work shows distinction during the freshman and sophomore college years may reasonably look forward to receiving financial aid during the remainder of his or her undergraduate career, possibly even up to the amount of full tuition.

It is expected that applicants will have completed four years of high-school Latin. Some work in Greek would be welcome but is not required.

Interested persons should write to Dr. Robert S. Cope, Director of Admissions, Galpin Administration Building, The College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. If an application for admission has not already been filed, this should be done at once.

---

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published eight times a year, from October through May.

## SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general price is \$4.25 (U.S.A. and Canada), \$4.50 (foreign). Single copies 65c (U.S.A. and Canada), 70c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single-copy rate. Subscriptions may be taken through one of the regional associations listed below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$4.25. Members may receive also the CLASSICAL OUTLOOK and CLASSICAL WORLD; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of taking either the CLASSICAL JOURNAL or CLASSICAL WORLD.

## MEMBERSHIPS

Address the secretary-treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, PAUL R. MURPHY, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. CANE, CLAUDE W. BARLOW, Clark University, Worcester, Mass. CAAS, JOSEPH A. MAURER, 22 Lamberton Hall, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. CAPS (Northern), MRS. MARY JEAN KEWLEY, 11043 S.E. 30th, Bellevue, Wash.; (Central), EDWARD Y. LINDSAY, 3480 Del Paso Blvd., North Sacramento 15, Cal.; (Southern), MRS. LOUISE M. J. JONES, 24262 Sage Ave., Boron, Cal.

## CORRESPONDENCE

All general editorial correspondence, MSS, etc. to NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Department of Classics, Indiana University, Bloomington. Departmental material to the proper editors. MSS from the Atlantic, New England and Pacific states to these regional editors. Concerning subscriptions and details of circulation to PROFESSOR MURPHY (address above). On advertising and other business items to J. D. SADLER, Furman University, Greenville, S.C.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

